

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,428, Vol. 55.

March 10, 1883.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

KILMAINHAM.

IT was scarcely credible that Mr. GLADSTONE, in deference to Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE's renewed request, would stultify Lord HARTINGTON by granting an inquiry into the matters which he has previously endeavoured, though without success, to wrap up in mystery. It was still less credible that Sir STAFFORD, on receiving a rebuff in form, which was in substance equivalent to a complete party victory, would lay himself open to a charge of obstruction by harassing the Government for confessing their conduct indefensible. For to such a confession does the thrice-repeated advance and retreat of Mr. GLADSTONE and Lord HARTINGTON on the subject amount. It may be taken henceforward as indisputable that the Government acknowledges that luckless experiment in governing by means of crime. The acknowledgment was indeed unnecessary, for the fact of the Kilmainham negotiations has long been proved and accepted by all reasonable men. But it has been finally made by Mr. GLADSTONE's refusal after challenge to meet inquiry, and there for the present may well be an end of the matter. The error is scored against the Government; its results, as far as they have yet accrued, are scored likewise. Both will come up again at the time of the great assize of all Governments—the next general election—and it will be the fault of the Opposition if they do not make due use of them. But, for the present, it would be a waste of time, and would tend to divert the just indignation of Englishmen who have not ceased to be Englishmen from its proper object, to spend the labour of Parliament in vain efforts to kick and spur reluctant champions into fighting. If the Government prefers pleading guilty in effect while pleading not guilty in words, that is the business of the Government. The flatterers and the fanatics, the partisans and the incapables of Mr. GLADSTONE's following may go on denying; the enormous majority of his own party knows and admits the facts. In one sense it is too late, and in another too early, for effective use of those facts; and for the Opposition to strain the forms of the House, or even in appearance to interrupt not so much the legislative crotchetts of the Government as its legitimate administrative business, would have been a mistake.

But if the Kilmainham Treaty is for the moment shelved, the Kilmainham policy is unfortunately by no means dead, and there are plenty of new developments of it which require attention. It has been a common reproach from the thick-and-thin supporters of the Government to those who quarrel with the Treaty and with other particulars of Mr. GLADSTONE's general Irish policy that they are throwing obstacles in the way of a Government whose actual Irish measures, as administered and directed by Lord SPENCER and Mr. TREVELYAN, are universally approved in England, or at any rate are universally approved save by some partisans of the Government itself. The fallacy does not require very elaborate exposure; but, if it requires any, the exposure has been given by Mr. TREVELYAN's speech on the proposed extension of the Irish franchise. The practical good sense of Mr. MULHOLLAND's remarks before it, and the complete dialectic refutation with which Mr. PLUNKET followed it, produce a singular effect on the mind when the three speeches are read together. At the present moment the Executive in Ireland is straining every nerve to counteract the effects of popular ignorance, popular prejudice, and popular madness. At

the present moment the same Executive is unable to present a candidate openly championing its general political views with the slightest chance of success in almost any constituency; while the defence and support of its actual and immediate policy has to be left to candidates of a different political faith in constituencies where the majority of voters are of the superior class, or where strong local influences counteract the terrorism and the disaffection which pervert the inferior class. Yet this is the moment which the official representative of the Irish Government chooses for announcing, avowedly on no principle except that of an academic consistency, his determination and the determination of his superiors to support, if not to initiate, a measure for the admission of more of the lower classes of Irishmen to the franchise. The situation would be a sufficiently grotesque illustration of the political insanity which will ruin the world for a crotchet, even if the recent declarations of Lord HARTINGTON had not been on record. But they are on record, and they are absolutely fatal to the proposed enfranchisement. If it is "madness" to give the lower class of Irishmen more power to elect guardians and town councillors and members of local boards, much more must it be madness to give them more power to elect members of Parliament. Yet the harm which the guardians and the town councillors can do, considerable as it is, is limited and insignificant in comparison with the power for mischief possessed by members of the Legislature. The political instruction, the fitness for the exercise of the franchise, the moral *status*, the attitude towards the kingdom and the Empire of the lower class of Irishmen, stand on record in myriads of documents from the reports of the inquiry into the Phoenix Park murders to the accounts of public meetings and the articles in Irish newspapers. All this Mr. TREVELYAN knows; none better. But the Liberal party supported such a proposal as the present when it was in Opposition, and Mr. TREVELYAN "cannot conceive a more "demoralizing thing" than that they should not support it now. Circumstances are nothing; history is nothing; fact is nothing. Because Mr. TREVELYAN, in obedience to his cherished political commonplaces, voted for something when he was an irresponsible private member, and when Ireland was to all appearance perfectly quiet, he must vote for it and his party must vote for it when Ireland is "sea working after storm"—after a storm which has yet by no means definitely blown over, and which in its rage has been almost as destructive as any recorded in Irish annals. It has been reserved for these days to witness this prodigious spectacle of practical incapacity and logical ineptitude on the part of men of ability and experience. It is to be hoped that it is not also reserved for these days to witness the approval of it by a whole party, or by the majority of a nation.

In comparison with such matters as these, the attempted defence of Mr. PARNELL by Mr. O'SHEA, and the damaging figures which not for the first time Lady FLORENCE DIXIE has brought forward against the Land League and its financial management, and which have been made more noteworthy by Mr. EGAN's reported flight from Dublin, are of minor interest. But they are not without more connexion than at first appears. For it must be remembered that Mr. JUSTIN McCARTHY, in the lame defence of his leader, his party, and himself with which he attempted to cover Mr. PARNELL's practical refusal to

plead, alleged certain other leagues and associations as parallels to the body which numbered SHERIDAN, BYRNE, and WALSH among its organizers. Mr. GEORGE HOWELL thereupon pointed out in a letter to the newspapers that one at least of the bodies to which Mr. McCARTHY had referred could at any rate show a clean balance-sheet, and Lady FLORENCE DIXIE has driven the remark home. With respect to Mr. O'SHEA, it is to be feared that "my friend," as he obligingly calls Mr. PARNELL, and there is some chivalry in the term, will hardly be grateful for his intervention. Mr. O'SHEA did not do his friend or his party much good by his original revelations about the Kilmainham business, and he has not done them much good now. It may be a very good party argument that Mr. FORSTER damaged Mr. GLADSTONE as much as Mr. PARNELL; there is at least no need to controvert it here. But there is a considerable number of Englishmen to whom the argument that Mr. FORSTER said things damaging to Mr. GLADSTONE will not be a conclusive demonstration that what he said was false. Nor is it perhaps quite effectual for Mr. O'SHEA to plead that he has seen Mr. PARNELL "with the mask off." The fault that the English public finds with Mr. PARNELL is that he thinks it worth while to appear with the mask on. It is contended that no man of honour ought to find a mask, even if it were as safe as the glass mask of the mediæval stories, sufficient to guarantee him from disgust and loathing in his dealings with the poisonous matters wherewith Mr. PARNELL has dealt; that no domino ought to be so complete an envelope as to shield him in his own opinion from the contagion of the company he has been keeping; no glove thick enough to induce him to touch the blood-stained hands he has (for aught that he cares to say) allowed to clasp his. It is quite conceivable that Mr. PARNELL was at one time sincerely afraid for his own life, as Mr. O'SHEA hints. But the conjurers who are afraid of the spirits they have conjured are not objects of very lively sympathy. And when Mr. O'SHEA hints that he himself might have been in danger from Mr. FORSTER's inconsiderate mention of his own mention of SHERIDAN, it is to be feared that the callous public will not be quite so much affected as Mr. O'SHEA imagines. Every one would be very sorry if anything happened to Mr. O'SHEA, a harmless, if rather blundering, gentleman given to backing his friends in a generous manner which shows that he deserves to have better ones. But, if people will keep bad company, even in the amiable character of volunteer negotiators, they must take the consequences.

SOUTH AFRICAN AFFAIRS.

THE Blue Book on the Affairs of Zululand and CETEWAYO would furnish materials for an interesting narrative. The student must overcome the difficulty of distinguishing proper names, some of them containing six syllables, all hard to pronounce and impossible to remember. The principal contributor to the compilation, Sir HENRY BULWER, Governor of Natal and Special Commissioner, displays throughout the correspondence statesmanlike judgment, considerable literary skill, and loyalty to official superiors when they disregard or overrule his opinions. It is well known that Sir H. BULWER consistently opposed the Zulu War; but from the time when CETEWAYO was defeated and dethroned he disapproved of all proposals for his restoration. Lord WOLSELEY, who established the system of government by a number of petty chiefs, takes occasion more than once voluntarily to remind Lord KIMBERLEY that the return of CETEWAYO "would be fraught with considerable danger to Natal, while it would be in direct contravention of the guarantee that Lord WOLSELEY gave to all the thirteen existing chiefs of Zululand, that under no circumstances should CETEWAYO be ever allowed to settle again in that country, without which guarantee none of them would have accepted the position of chief with all its many responsibilities." When the Government had resolved to restore CETEWAYO, five of the thirteen chiefs acquiesced in a decision which it was impossible for them to resist. Of the remaining eight, one, USIBEBU, has been confirmed in the independent sovereignty of his own territory; five will probably take refuge in a strip of territory which has been reserved; and the two foreigners, the Englishman JOHN DUNN, and the Basuto HLUBI, occupy lands outside CETEWAYO's dominions. The colonists of Natal have protested in the

strongest language against the restoration, and there is no reason to suppose that it was desired by any portion of the Zulu population. Four hundred thousand natives living in the colony, though they begin to be pressed for room, have abstained from settling in vacant lands beyond the frontier unless they could be assured of English administration and protection. Some of them will now migrate into the reserved territory; though Lord KIMBERLEY, acting in this, as in all other matters, in opposition to the advice of Sir HENRY BULWER, has largely reduced the area proposed by the GOVERNOR.

A Secretary of State is dispensed from the necessity of explaining to his subordinates the reasons of his decisions; and, as the policy of restoring the Zulu KING will probably not be discussed in Parliament, Lord KIMBERLEY's motives and the arguments or authority which commanded his assent, must for the present remain matters for conjecture. On one side are all the official and ex-official experts in South African affairs. The restoration was supported and ultimately effected by Bishop COLENSO, by the Natal Correspondent of the *Daily News*, and by the Aborigines Protection Society. Sir H. BULWER more than once complains with apparent reason of the interference of an ecclesiastical dignitary in matters of State policy; but whether Lord KIMBERLEY was under the influence of the BISHOP, or whether he arrived at the same conclusions on independent grounds, the GOVERNOR's remonstrances received no attention. The request that the ex-KING should be restored, though it was ostensibly preferred by relatives of CETEWAYO, originated at Bishopstowe. A few chiefs who professed to claim his personal liberation, but not the re-establishment of the Zulu kingdom, were advised by the BISHOP that if all Zululand wished for the restoration of the KING, they should make their wishes known in a proper manner to the Government. The original visit to the BISHOP was, according to the notions and customs of the country, an act of gross disrespect to the Colonial Government. The result of the BISHOP's suggestions was a visit made by no less than six hundred chiefs and others to Maritzburg without the permission of the Government or of the RESIDENT in Zululand. It may be added that Bishop COLENSO had already contrived to convey letters from CETEWAYO to some of his family. The Government properly refused to receive the intruders, who were described by the partisans of the KING as a deputation. On this or another occasion a lady of the BISHOP's family advised the chiefs to redress certain wrongs for themselves if they failed to obtain satisfaction from the Government. The consequence was a petty civil war, in which several lives were lost. An indignant protest of the Government against the reception of the unauthorized mission at Bishopstowe appears not to have been thought by Lord KIMBERLEY worthy of an answer. The Committee of the Aborigines Protection Society forwarded to the Secretary of State a document headed "Account of the Great Zulu Deputation from a Zulu Point of View." It afterwards appeared that the paper was partly translated and partly composed by Bishop COLENSO. Sir H. BULWER from first to last denied that there was any deputation, or that his unwelcome visitors represented, or even affected to represent, any one but themselves. In one of his despatches he reminded Lord KIMBERLEY that the offensive interference of Bishop COLENSO had greatly hampered his efforts to prevent the Zulu war.

Philanthropists and patrons of aboriginal races too often forget that the interests of all the members of a barbarous community are not necessarily the same. By obtaining the ear of the Minister of the Department Bishop COLENSO and his allies have succeeded in setting a colonial Government at defiance and in gratifying the wishes of a dethroned despot. They have not sufficiently remembered that CETEWAYO's subjects are of the same colour with himself, and that they may possibly be subjected to the mode of administration which he formerly practised. A year ago they were safe from "witch smelling," from "eating up," and from compulsory military celibacy. At present their only security against his caprice consists in the promises which he made with unconcealed reluctance to Lord KIMBERLEY in London, to Sir HERCULES ROBINSON at the Cape, and to Sir THEOPHILUS SHEPSTONE on his installation in Zululand. It is a grave mistake to attribute to South African tribes the form of patriotism or loyalty which has been gradually developed in Europe. The real feelings and opinions of the Zulus are perhaps not less suitable to their social and political condition. As one of the

chiefs explains in a conversation reported in the Blue Book, a number of tribes were formed by the conquests of CHAKA into the Zulu nation, which was in turn dissolved by the defeat and capture of CETEWAYO. The tribal rights consequently revived, while the paramount power passed into the hands of the English Government by the simplest of all titles, consisting in the right of conquest. Many of the Zulus settled in Natal were anxious to seek new lands beyond the Tugela, not only in JOHN DUNN's country, but in the territories of the other appointed chiefs; but they required as a preliminary condition some assurance that they would be followed by the English "Shadow"—or, in other words, by its protection or sovereignty. They also are aborigines, though they forfeit their claim to sympathy by their reliance on a civilized Government. They will now willingly migrate into the reserved territory, in which no Europeans will be allowed to acquire land, while the inhabitants will be secure against indigenous tyranny. The additional lands which were reserved in Sir H. BULWER's project would have sheltered a large and peaceful population if they had not been surrendered by Lord KIMBERLEY to the philanthropists and their formidable client CETEWAYO.

The pledges which were exacted by Lord KIMBERLEY may or may not be partially redeemed. The KING'S neighbours are chiefly concerned with the fulfilment of his promise not to reorganize his army. The liberty which has been enjoyed under the petty chiefs may perhaps have fostered a spirit of resistance to oppression, but it is impossible to judge of the temper either of the KING or of his subjects. If his conscience needed an excuse for any breach of faith which he may be tempted to commit, he can always allege with a certain degree of truth that his bargain with the English Government was made under duress. He may add that he concealed neither his repugnance to the diminution of his territory nor his animosity against his adversaries, and especially against JOHN DUNN. Sir H. BULWER and the other opponents of the Zulu war were undoubtedly right in their belief that CETEWAYO's former armaments were directed against the Boers of the Transvaal, and not against the English Colonies. It is not a little remarkable that the recent efforts of Bishop COLENSO and the Aborigines' Protection Society were seconded by a strangely impudent request on the part of the Transvaal Government that CETEWAYO should be restored. Of the insolent disregard of the Boer Government for the Convention with England, and of their cruelty and injustice to the natives on their borders, an instructive account is given in another Blue Book. The Assembly of the Congregational Union, which probably gave a cordial approval to Mr. GLADSTONE's unhappy surrender, now "learns with grief and alarm that the lawless incursions of certain Boers from the Transvaal threaten the utter ruin of peace, civilization, and Christianity in the country of the Bechuanas." They might have added that the marauders are acting with the full sanction of the Transvaal Government. The English SECRETARY OF STATE falls into the opposite error in dealing with the Zulus. The best security for CETEWAYO's adherence to his professions consists in his experience of English power. It is possible that his visit to England may have confirmed the impression; and he has hitherto always professed devotion and gratitude to the QUEEN. The correspondence which is now published tends strongly to confirm the colonial opinion that a hazardous experiment has been tried by the Imperial Government. Lord KIMBERLEY either had no explanation of his policy to give, or he deliberately declined to correct judgments which he must have considered erroneous. It is evident that he had from the first virtually determined on the course which he ultimately pursued. He was not unreasonably dissatisfied with the personal injustice of keeping in confinement a defeated potentate who had committed no crime. On the other hand, he seems scarcely to have paid sufficient attention to the interests of Natal or of Zululand.

LORD LANSDOWNE'S MOTION.

NO one with whom the axiom of a participator in the Land League agitation that "all landlords are 'devils'" is not an article of faith can help sympathizing very sincerely with the landlords of Ireland at this moment. They have seen themselves, for no fault of their own, or for the fault of an infinitesimal minority of their

number, already mulcted, or in process of being mulcted, to the extent of some twenty per cent. of their property. For the first time in English history all compensation for this loss, avowedly inflicted on them for a public purpose, has been refused them. But the arbitrary diminution of their capital is the least part of their sufferings. They have been reduced to the position, or little better than the position, of rent-chargers on their own lands. They are deprived of almost all the incidents which make landowning desirable. They foresee clearly enough that in any future agricultural distress in Ireland they will be nearly powerless to help, and yet will be exposed to the odium of not helping. They can only take their own land into their own management at a great expense—an expense in most cases practically prohibitive. But this by no means exhausts the list of their misfortunes. Instead of Mr. GLADSTONE's measure having secured the value of such of their property as is left to them, it has rendered it almost valueless. It is valueless because it is nearly impossible to realize unless at an enormous sacrifice. No one but the actual tenant is likely to be tempted to buy a thing so little tempting as the landlord's interest under the Land Act, and the tenant has a shrewd suspicion that if he holds back that interest will probably become his without any payment at all. Meanwhile capital is more than ever diverted from Ireland, and absenteeism tends to become the rule rather than the exception. The tenants themselves are demoralized by the uncertainty of things, and outside both landlords and tenants there is the fringe of labourers waiting, and hitherto waiting vainly, for their share of the plunder.

Lord LANSDOWNE'S proposal to put an end to this state of things, or at least to make an experiment upon it by seeking and adopting means for making the purchase clauses of past Land Acts a reality, is a very natural one under the circumstances. It is the only obvious and easy way of escape for the landlord, and it is the most direct and plain method of lifting the tenant out of his present unhealthy state of waiting for the landlord's shoes, by giving him an interest in improving his own property instead of a craving for the property of somebody else. It bears on its face a plausible air as if of a logical completion of the Land Act policy of rooting the tenant in the soil. It cannot, without the most barefaced cynicism or the most flagrant inconsistency, be opposed openly and directly by those who favoured the Land Act itself. Moreover it can boast, if by no means of a consensus of political opinion in its favour, at any rate of a select body of influential politicians on both sides in Parliament who have at different times expressed themselves as advocates of something similar. It commends itself to some as a completion of Mr. GLADSTONE's policy; to others as the readiest way of repairing the injustice of that policy to the landlord, and huddling up its ill effects on the tenant. It seems to have been decreed by Parliament, if not by Providence, that Ireland is to be given up *in seculorum* to the small agricultural tenant with his holding arranged and secured for him. The simplest method of such arrangement and security may well seem to be peasant proprietorship. It is true that such proprietorship, in every country where it is not corrected and supported by the presence of manufacturing interests and urban industries, has proved fertile in evils, but Irish tenancy, it may be said, has proved fertile in evils likewise. It is true that the last state of the peasant proprietor is likely to be worse than the first, but at any rate there will not be the scapegoat of landlordism to tempt and demoralize English statesmen in the future. If, in short—it may be said—the contention that the woes of Ireland are due to the fact that the peasant has not his own land to do as he likes with be accepted, let it be accepted consistently, and let the land be honestly made his own to do what he likes with so that he may take the consequences; and his success or his failure be alike on his own head.

Such are the main arguments (irrespective of those generally urged for a peasant proprietary) which may be urged for Lord LANSDOWNE'S motion, and it cannot be denied that they have weight. As arguments *ad homines*—that is to say, to the members of HER MAJESTY'S present Government—they have a very great deal of weight. Only those who take the statements of their party leaders for gospel without inquiry and without modification will accept Lord CARLINGFORD'S view of the state of Ireland. Mr. GLADSTONE'S policy has, in effect, locked up the landlord's capital in an enchanted castle

where the lawful owner cannot get at it, and round which the tenant, neglecting his proper business, prowls to see if he can master the secret of entrance. But whether it would really be for the interest of the Irish landlord, of the Irish tenant, or of the English nation, that the difficulty should be solved by an artificial creation of peasant proprietors at the expense, or at least by the intermediation, of the State is a question which is not readily to be answered in the affirmative. In the first place, it is necessary to ask whether the tenant is ready to buy; and, if he is not ready, who is to force him to do so? For the plan to be really remedial, even in its own sense, it would seem that a compulsory investment must be forced on every occupier whose landlord desires to sell. Otherwise, considering the conduct of Mr. GLADSTONE on the one side and the promises of Mr. PARNELL on the other, it would be strange if the tenant were willing to give what for him is a great sum to obtain what he may well hope to gain for nothing. But, even supposing a general willingness on the part of the tenants to buy, competition from non-tenants is out of the question, and without competition the price obtainable, as shown by actual instances hitherto, is scarcely likely to tempt landlords. Of what use would the ten or twelve years' purchase of the new reduced rents, which seems to be the present value, save in exceptional cases, be to a landlord who is often encumbered up to a full half of the amount of the old gross rental? And if it be said that "fair price" is a just complement of "fair rent," who is to make up the fair price? The taxpayer, as in the case of the Arrears Act? It is to be feared that landlords would find English Liberals, and perhaps some English Conservatives, decidedly slack in proposing or supporting any such measure as that. But, these objections being waived, let it be granted or supposed that a considerable number of landlords and tenants may come to an arrangement satisfactory to both, and that the funds somehow or other are found for the transfer, without burdening the taxpayers too heavily or exposing the State to too great a danger of loss. That is a very wide supposition; but the argument shall stretch to it. Then comes the all-important question whether the result would in reality be beneficial. A considerable number of Irish tenants are alleged, not by one side only, to find an insuperable difficulty in paying even reduced rents, and living one year with another. How would they manage the increased yearly payments necessitated by the discharge of their obligations to the State? The greatest curse of Ireland is known to be the subdivision of holdings; and at present under the Land Act there is a certain, though not perhaps a sufficient, check on sub-letting, subdivision, clandestine or open sale of parts of interests, and the like. Now if the peasant proprietor is to be a proprietor in anything more than name, it will be impossible to continue this check on him; while, if experience shows anything, it shows that he will be constantly tempted to do what is at present forbidden. At present the landlord's rights of pre-emption and of ejection for non-payment of rent are to a certain extent checks on injudicious borrowing. In the case of the peasant proprietor the gombeen man will be without hindrance *tout entier à sa proie attaché*. If the buying of holdings really became tempting and usual (and if it did not, it is not worth discussing), emigration and the consolidation of tenancies—the sole hopes of Ireland—must necessarily be stopped.

In short, there are too good reasons for fearing that the artificial encouragement of peasant proprietary, instead of being a remedy for the evils of the Land Act, would intensify them, would undo the little good that that Act contains, and would check the operation of the natural cure for the mischief. Supposing it to be firmly administered for two or three statutory terms (which is indeed a large supposition) many landlords will no doubt be ruined; but more tenants will be ruined, and Nature, re-entering notwithstanding Mr. GLADSTONE's expulsion of her, will set matters partially right by free contract and consolidation following on the exercise of the right of pre-emption and the creation of future tenancies. It will be a hard and a cruel process, but *sic voluit, sic jussit* Mr. GLADSTONE; and, if its hardness and its cruelty are not interfered with, good may yet result. It is but too much to be feared that the creation of peasant proprietorships on a large scale would increase the suffering, while it would indefinitely postpone the possible good result.

EGYPT.

THE first subject on which Mr. GLADSTONE had to touch after his return to Parliamentary life was Egypt. On the vote in Supply for additional expenditure in Egypt exception was taken to the cost of a house at Port Said which was suddenly bought by the naval authorities in order to facilitate the occupation of the entrance of the Canal. No one could deny that the purchase was a wise one from a military point of view, but the price given was undoubtedly large. It was only half what the owner had paid for the property, but it was double what he had previously asked. As Mr. RYLANDS gave himself the pleasure of announcing, directly war begins the floodgates of expenditure are opened. The exigencies of war made it necessary to buy a large house at much more than would have been got for it in ordinary times, and the extra amount paid was as necessary a part of the cost of the war as the expense of moving the Marines who occupied the house when it was bought. The slight debate caused by the purchase might have passed unnoticed had not Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH innocently asked what was going to be done with the house now the war was over, and more generally, what was going to be done with Egypt now the war was over. Especially he wanted to know whether it was really true that our troops are to be withdrawn at the end of six months. To these questions Mr. GLADSTONE replied in his most characteristic style. He had two things to say which it was most desirable he should say. In the first place, he had to state positively that England would not withdraw from Egypt until all the objects which we went there to secure had been fully attained. In the next place, he had to make it clear that the Government, having to do with circumstances daily changing, being jealously watched by foreign Powers, could not and would not give premature information to the English Parliament. But even in saying these things he seemed to revel in the exercise of all his old power of clothing simple thoughts in mysterious and intricate language; and when he got to so congenial a task as explaining away the blunt phraseology of Lord HARTINGTON, he strayed into subtleties and intricacies of expression which probably no one else on earth could have devised. Lord HARTINGTON expressed a hope, as Mr. GLADSTONE called it, that the troops would be withdrawn in six months. But it seemed due to Lord HARTINGTON to explain that he was not hoping at random. On what, then, was Lord HARTINGTON's hope founded? "That hope was derived from an impression "which he had received from such a review of the circumstances of the case as in the present development of "those circumstances was practicable." Let us hope that the jealous foreigners who study Mr. GLADSTONE's speeches to find out what we are going to do with Egypt will own themselves checkmated when they get to this account of the origin of Lord HARTINGTON's hopes. Anxious correspondents have been recently telegraphing to say that Mr. GLADSTONE during his stay in Paris in no way committed himself as to Egypt; and certainly if this was anything like the style which he adopted in conversing with eminent Frenchmen, it may be safely said that, if he made some of them happier, he left none of them wiser.

Mr. GLADSTONE went over familiar ground when he said that what we had got to do in Egypt was to establish order and stability, to improve Egyptian institutions, to see that the international engagements of Egypt were fulfilled, and to provide for the safety of the Canal. These are all excellent objects; and the better it is understood that England is pledged to see that they are secured, the clearer will be the position of the Government in the eyes of England and of Europe. There are special difficulties in the way of securing every one of these objects; but the establishment of order and stability is so much the chief need and the chief difficulty of Egypt that everything else may be regarded as subordinate. It is the business of statesmen to overcome difficulties, and no men could be better fitted to overcome the difficulties attending the establishment of order and stability, or in other words of providing the Egyptian Government with an armed force which it can trust, and which we can trust, than Lord DUFFERIN and Sir EVELYN WOOD. But the difficulties with which they have to contend are enormous. The army of the future, small as it is, seems hard to get. Recruits are only to be got by conscription, and these heroes of law and order have to be brought in chains to the scene of their future duties and

glories. All the recruits are from the country, and it seems hard that the whole burden of establishing law and order should fall on the poor fellahs, over whose miseries we have so often been asked to weep, while the inhabitants of the large towns are excused. But the inhabitants of the large towns are mostly of such very equivocal character that it seems wiser to exempt them. So the fellahs have to do all the work, and it must be said for them that they seem inclined to do it well. They are fairly intelligent, good-tempered, and fond of discipline, and Sir EVELYN WOOD will before long get together a decent body as the rank and file of his army. But how to get trustworthy officers is a much more serious problem. The ordinary Egyptian officer is only a private with different clothes on him. He inspires neither fear nor confidence; he is a brother among brothers, and has not the slightest notion of establishing order and stability even in half a company. The only officers in Egypt who have any military aptitude are not Egyptians, but Turks; and Lord DUFFERIN had been but a short time in Egypt before he discovered that the members of the Turkish caste or clique are a very puzzling set of people, and that it is almost equally dangerous to ignore and to employ them. A more recent discovery has been that the police must be all under English inspectors. Wherever it turns the English Government finds more and more that it cannot establish order and stability through Egyptians only. The most it can do is to use Egyptians so far as they can be used in accomplishing this first of all its tasks. Far too much attention is given in England to the mere withdrawal of English troops. They are to be withdrawn not that we may clear out of Egypt, but because other instruments of establishing order and stability have been found. The advantage of their going entirely depends on the adequacy of the force replacing them. So far as can be seen at present, this adequacy depends on the force being more largely under English control than was at first imagined to be necessary. In course of time, if enough Englishmen are employed to control the native force, it may be possible to withdraw all our troops, and content ourselves with the knowledge that, if new danger arose, the telegraph would soon bring very efficacious supporters of order and stability from Malta and Cyprus.

After the establishment of a Government strong enough to make life and property safe, the next need of Egypt in order of importance is that of having its finances properly regulated. This is a hard matter to arrange, not because Egypt is not rich enough, but because every European Power, great and small, and also the United States, insist on being consulted when any dealing with the finances of Egypt is in question. This claim is made on the ground that the International Tribunals derive their authority from all these Powers, and the International Tribunals are authorized by the Code to make the Egyptian Government pay any sum which the Tribunals may think is due by it to any foreigner. In a Blue Book recently published a long history is given of the protracted and tedious efforts it cost the Egyptian and English Governments to get a Commission appointed which should remove the inquiry into claims for compensation to sufferers from arson and pillage at Alexandria or elsewhere from the jurisdiction of these terrible Tribunals. In order to do this six Great Powers, six small ones, and the United States, had all to be got to give their consent. No one refused altogether, but except Germany, who was ready to oblige England in anything and everything, all had some little objection to urge or improvement to suggest. France objected that the form of the proposed decree involved the abandonment of the Control. Italy objected that, as the first suggestion of a Commission came from the Controllers, there might seem to be too strong a recognition of the Control, which Italy wished to ignore. Greece would do nothing until it was promised a delegate all to itself. The six minor Powers were sensitive and unhappy until they got the promise of one delegate among them. One-sixth of one delegate out of ten was the price they demanded for their invaluable concurrence; and they did not get even at this result without some qualms and disturbance of mind, for there was an awful moment when the dignity of Belgium was wounded by a rash proposal of Sweden. By patience, and by the use day and night of pressing telegrams, Lord GRANVILLE smoothed away opposition, and on January 15 the KHEDIVE was allowed to issue

the decree establishing the Commission. But all, or almost all, of the Powers steadily and successfully refused to let the KHEDIVE give any intimation of the source whence the funds for settling the claims established by the Commission are to come from. The Egyptian Government, guided by Sir AUCKLAND COLVIN, is naturally and properly desirous that these funds should be provided by the application of the sinking fund of the bonded debt to meeting the claims. After paying interest on the debt, Egypt provides a sum which even in bad years reaches half a million sterling as a sinking fund, and the bondholders ought to be very thankful that their property has been preserved to them at so very small a sacrifice as the suspension for a time of the sinking fund. Probably the Powers will see this and give their consent some day; but they will only be brought to adhere to a proposal, however just and sensible, after a long and wearisome wrangle.

THE AMERICAN TARIFF BILL.

THE American Congress, which completed its term on Sunday last, passed, contrary to general expectation, a Bill for the alteration of indirect taxes a few hours before its dissolution. It is not expected that the PRESIDENT will summon the Congress which has now succeeded before next December. The fiscal changes which have been effected had their origin in the defeat of the Republicans at the autumn elections. The leaders of the party thought it expedient to attempt to recover popularity while they had still the control of the House of Representatives. The small majority which they return for the time in the Senate may probably not be permanent. The profession by the Republicans of comparatively liberal views on fiscal legislation perhaps indicates an approaching change in public opinion; but the Protectionists reposed a well-founded trust in the party which has long devoted itself to their service, and they were themselves anxious to get rid of the large surplus which is applicable to the reduction of the debt. It had become evident that the maintenance of domestic monopolies would become more invidious and more uncertain when the debt was finally paid off. The manufacturers and their allies consequently demanded either the diminution or the entire removal of taxes in the nature of excise duties. Their efforts have been in a great measure successful, though they have been compelled to purchase additional protection at the cost of a partial and illusory reduction of the Customs tariff. The revenue derived from internal duties has been reduced by 13,000,000, and the tariff by 5,000,000, or, excluding a partial repeal of the sugar duty, by about 2,900,000. Some of the reductions in Customs duties apply to raw materials, and are therefore advantageous to the manufacturers. The rates on wool, for instance, are lowered to the extent of 18 per cent., while the duties on woollen goods are increased. The duties on common earthenware are increased by 33 per cent.; the duties on iron and on cotton goods are also raised. Some Protectionists are nevertheless dissatisfied with even a pretended approach to a system of free trade. It is not unnatural that they should be alarmed at the first attempt of their Republican confederates to court the favour of rational economists.

The Democrats were of course perfectly aware of the motives which caused the sudden activity of the moribund Congress. Although a majority of their number opposes the reform of the tariff, the party includes in its ranks nearly all the adherents of free trade. The immediate result was a kind of schism which proved the ingenuity of the Republican tactics. Some Democrats supported the proposed reductions of revenue, while the majority endeavoured to defeat the measure, or rather to postpone it for the consideration of the incoming Congress. The Senate and the House of Representatives respectively passed different Bills; and the dispute was complicated by a controversy on the right of the Senate to initiate fiscal legislation. The journals of both parties confidently anticipated the failure of the whole enterprise, both because the Congress was rapidly approaching its expiration, and on the ground of reasonable doubts whether the promoters were in earnest. At last the two branches of the Legislature agreed on a conference which resulted in the appointment of a Joint Committee carefully provided with a majority of orthodox Protectionists. The Committee reported in favour of a scheme which was with

some alterations finally adopted by both Houses at midnight on the 2nd of March. The Senate passed the Bill by a majority of one, and the House of Representatives by 152 to 116. The division was not entirely on party lines, for sixteen Democrats voted with the majority, and eleven Republicans with the minority. The Protectionists are probably satisfied with the result, as the duties on the most important articles are maintained or raised, while the internal duties and the surplus revenue have been largely reduced. Both sections of the party hitherto in power affect to believe that the Bill will enable the Republicans to secure the next election. It is supposed that the Free-traders will be grateful for a change; and with better reason the great body of the Republicans rejoice in the substantial victory of the Protectionists. It is difficult to understand why either Democrats or neutrals should be converted by the dying act of the Congress.

Even the most zealous advocates of monopoly will scarcely repeat on the present occasion the familiar assertion that the change in the tariff was procured by the expenditure of "English gold." The balance of advantage to English commerce will be either insignificant or negative. It is to be regretted that a great market should be partially closed to English commerce in defiance of all reasonable principles; yet if one among civilized nations alone understands the theory of buying and selling, Englishmen, while they justly boast that they are not, as other men are, heretics in political economy, ought to remember that they have been enlightened by a kind of accident. The supporters of the Corn Laws were signally and finally defeated, not by the arguments of their assailants, but because they were few in numbers and therefore politically weak. Mr. COBDEN and Mr. BRIGHT would have preached in vain to an agricultural population of petty freeholders. It was an easier task to attack the landed gentry. It fortunately happened that no other branch of English industry at that time needed artificial protection. The shipowners, who attempted to set up a special claim to legislative favour, have since proved their ability to defeat all competitors, and most completely their former American rivals. The new Tariff, though it includes some provisions intended to facilitate ship-building, will not counteract the injurious results of a vicious policy. If it were possible to exercise control or influence over the fiscal legislation of foreign countries, there is some doubt whether the establishment of universal freedom of trade would confer unmixed benefits on English industry. Protection almost always tends to increase the price, and to check improvements in the quality, of products which enjoy an artificial monopoly. Up to the present time English commerce exceeds in amount the trade of other nations in markets which are common to all. Those who might under a more natural system become customers for American produce compensate in some degree for the partial exclusion of English manufacturers from the United States. It unfortunately happens that conquest and annexation are constantly narrowing the area which is exempt from protective tariffs. Wherever Russia or France extends the blessings of its civilization the best and cheapest fabrics are withdrawn from the consumption of the inhabitants. The claim of the United States to a protectorate over the whole American continent is associated with a similar policy.

The debates which have ended in a large reduction of internal revenue and a slight modification of Customs duties were conducted on all sides with careful regard to party interests. Both Democrats and Republicans remain in the same relative position. Relief from taxation is always welcome; and the repeal of taxes to the amount of several millions may perhaps perceptibly increase the general prosperity; but the two great parties have contributed equally to the result. In the new Congress which entered on its functions on the 4th of March, the Democrats have a large majority in the House, and the Republicans for the present, if they are united, control the Senate. There is no probability that parties will try their strength on any important issue. The fiscal changes which have been now effected will for some time be considered as sufficient. As the produce of the remaining taxes increases with the growth of wealth and population, the consequent accumulation of the annual surpluses which forms a Sinking Fund will again cause uneasiness among the classes interested in protective duties. In a few years it will be difficult to avoid the discharge of the national debt

or its reduction within narrow limits. The reconsideration of the tariff will then once more become unavoidable; but there may perhaps be some difficulty in repressing the natural elasticity of the public resources. In many instances a reduction of the tariff would increase the revenue. It is not impossible that the Democrats may before the expiration of the present term of Congress begin to associate themselves with the Free-trade policy which is supported by a section of the body. In other matters there is no intelligible distinction between the two great parties. The Federal Government has long ceased to interfere in the domestic politics of the Southern States, and other grounds of controversy have become obsolete.

American politicians in search of excitement must console themselves for the stagnation of legislative activity by the knowledge that in another year the interest of a Presidential election will necessarily recur. Foreigners are sometimes puzzled to understand the importance of a contest which seldom produces any political result. If the last election had been decided in favour of the Democratic candidate, General HANCOCK's Presidency would have been indistinguishable from that of Mr. ARTHUR, except that a few lucrative posts and many petty offices would have been held by another set of occupants. The material progress of the Republic will be as little affected by the struggle which will take place in the summer of 1884; but the preparations on both sides, and especially the management of the nominating Conventions, will provide congenial occupation for busy election managers. It is not certain whether General HANCOCK will be again proposed by his party. It is understood that there will be a struggle among the Republicans between the respective supporters of Mr. BLAINE and Mr. CONKLING. There will probably be no attempt to nominate the actual PRESIDENT for a second term of office. The apparent disproportion between effort and the political objects to be attained may sometimes amuse distant observers; but the monotony of American politics, arising from assured prosperity and quiet, may well excite the admiration and envy of Englishmen. In that country there is no factitious demand for constitutional changes; and, since the subsidence of the agitation which ended in the Civil War, there is no general or provincial disaffection. A population of fifty millions, with perfect freedom of internal trade over half a continent, can afford to dispense with the privilege of unrestricted foreign intercourse. The chief fiscal embarrassment of the moment consists in the difficulty of limiting the surplus produce of the revenue. General unanimity of opinion accounts for the seeming frivolity of political contests between powerful parties which range themselves in mutual opposition, like two sides chosen for a game.

THE RESURRECTION OF GAMBETTISM.

THE three proposals that have been debated in the French Chambers since the new Ministry has been in office have enabled them to define their position with more precision than is possible in a formal declaration. They can now be judged by their deeds as well as by their words, by the measures they are prepared to accept or determined to resist as well as by the phrases which can be indifferently employed to describe very different policies. The only critical question that has yet had time to arise is the amendment of the Constitution demanded by M. BARDET and M. ANDRIEUX. Opportunism has never shown itself more frank—its enemies would say more shameless—than in the course of this discussion. At the time of the General Election the contention, and as it seemed the well-founded contention, of GAMBETTA and his followers was that revision had been the one issue really presented to the electorate, and that the electorate had returned a perfectly unmistakable answer. The functions and the mode of election of the Senate were declared to be plainly unfitted for a Republic, and the business of the Chamber of Deputies was to propose without loss of time the changes which are necessary to bring them into harmony with the order of things now established in France. Though GAMBETTA is dead his spirit survives in the new Cabinet. But as regards revision the spirit is altered past recognition. M. FERRY reminds the Chamber that revision is impossible without the consent of the Senate, and that as

the consent of the Senate will certainly not be given, the idea had better be put aside. Hereafter indeed, when the elections are again approaching and revision may once more be a popular cry, the Cabinet will be prepared to reconsider their course. If this decision were the only index to the new policy, it might show a genuine return to those common-sense views from which the Republic has of late years so persistently turned away its face. It is clear that an attempt to revise the Constitution at this moment would shake whatever confidence in the Government has survived the recent exhibitions of folly in the Chamber and impotence in the Executive, and make it more than ever impossible to keep a Ministry in being for more than the weeks or months which have lately formed the average term of each successive Cabinet. So far, therefore, M. FERRY has taken the only course which in common prudence was open to him.

Unfortunately this is not the only indication he has given of the policy which he proposes to pursue. His attitude in reference to revision must be viewed in combination with his attitude on those ecclesiastical questions which either chance or design is continually throwing in the way of French Governments. The Municipal Reform Bill has given the Cabinet an occasion of showing in what temper it means to deal with the Concordat; the Bill to regulate associations, lately before the Senate, has given it an occasion of speaking its mind upon the status of religious congregations. If the effect of the amendment leaving it optional with each commune whether it will make good any deficit there may be in the church accounts of the parish has not been exaggerated by the Republican journals, M. ROCHE has been able to bring about a local disestablishment. In many communes the fees and collections are not enough to keep the church in repair and to defray the necessary expense of the services. In many communes the municipality will not be willing, now that the decision is left to themselves, to find the money that is wanted to balance the account. Where these two conditions happen to coincide, one of two things must happen. Either the church must be closed, or the means for keeping it in repair and for maintaining the services will have to be provided by voluntary effort. Either way the state of things contemplated in the Concordat will be greatly modified. In the first case the Catholic population will be left as completely without a Church as though the Concordat had been repealed and the Budget of Public Worship suppressed. In the second case Disestablishment will for the first time be presented to the authorities of the Catholic Church as a change which may bring them as much gain as loss. It is in these country communes where voluntary religious effort is either weak or wanting that the connexion with the State has been most valuable. In the large towns the contributions of the civil power are small in comparison with those furnished by private liberality. The effect of M. ROCHE's Amendment will be to withdraw State aid just where it is really wanted, while continuing to give it where it could pretty easily be done without. In proportion as the work of the parish priest is crippled there is a greater need, according to the view of the Roman Catholic Church, that this work should be supplemented by the religious orders. But the new Cabinet has made a clean breast of it on this point also. The Association Law which till Thursday was before the Senate was drafted by DUFRAURE, and consequently was not likely to depart unduly from the traditions of French jurisprudence by giving any excessive liberty in religious matters. But DUFRAURE saw then, just as M. JULES SIMON sees now, that there are liberties which, though they might be withheld under a Catholic Monarchy, cannot, with consistency or even decency, be withheld under a non-Catholic Republic. The Bill proposed therefore to put all voluntary associations on the same level. The State was not to inquire into the object which the members of the Association had in mind in joining it. It might be commerce, or prayer, or literary intercourse, or charitable work; but whatever it was, Frenchmen would be equally free to join together for its promotion, provided it did not constitute a direct attack upon the State. M. WALDECK-ROUSSEAU, the new Minister of the Interior, does not share this view. He is a strenuous supporter of liberty of association for every purpose which is not religious; but as soon as religion comes in M. WALDECK-ROUSSEAU's ideas of liberty undergo a revolution. Consequently M. SIMON's Bill was opposed by the Government, and was rejected by

the Senate on Thursday. In this way the ecclesiastical situation becomes exceedingly simple. In attacking the Church the Republic may use any weapons it likes, but in defending herself against the Republic the Church is only to use such weapons as the Republic likes.

In all this the policy of the new Ministry is GAMBETTA's policy over again. The Republic is to be moderate in secular matters, and it is to make up for this by being extreme in religious matters. The Ministry know that if they are to gain even forbearance on the part of the Extreme Left, it must be by showing themselves hostile to the Church. That is the only institution which can in their opinion be threatened without provoking a degree of distrust in the country at large which will far more than outweigh any benefit that the favour of the Extreme Left can do them. The Church, they think, has not that hold upon the nation, or upon any large part of the nation, which makes it dangerous to attack it; and it may therefore be attacked without hesitation whenever there is even a momentary gain to be secured by it. Politics in France seem once more in a fair way to become a simple duel between the Republic and the Church. In this conflict the Republic labours under two disadvantages. It misunderstands its adversary, and it equally misunderstands its ally. Religions are exempted from the general law that the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest part. In religions it is just the contrary; they are strong in virtue of their strongest elements. The Republicans overlook this fact. They see the weaknesses, the follies, the excesses, of French Catholicism, and by these they judge it. They do not see its enthusiasm or its self-devotion, and so they are not likely to count the cost of fighting it. They seem equally unable to appreciate the nature of the support they must secure in order to overthrow Catholicism. Opposition to religion in France is an absorbing and consuming passion. It knows nothing of compromise, nothing of toleration. Such a passion, if invoked, may carry those who appeal to it very much further than they intend or desire. It can never be a good servant, for by whomsoever employed it will never be content till it has become the master.

WESTMINSTER AND HURLINGHAM.

THE debate on Mr. ANDERSON's Bill was characterized by a curious abundance of cross reasoning. Some of the speakers praised the Bill because it aimed at something more than the abolition of pigeon-shooting; others thought that it might deserve support if it could be made to abolish pigeon-shooting, and nothing more. The carted deer, the bagged fox, and the trapped hare had each their advocates. If one man argued that these forms of sport ought not to escape prohibition because they were at least as cruel as pigeon-shooting, another immediately followed with the plea that pigeon-shooting ought not to be forbidden because it was no more cruel than stag-hunting or coursing. Of one of the objects which Mr. ANDERSON declared himself to have in view scarcely any notice was taken. Mr. ANDERSON, had he chosen to do so, could probably have told quite as repulsive stories of the cruelties practised on animals kept in menageries and trained for exhibition as he actually told of the cruelties practised on the tame pigeons which now do duty for blue rocks. It is to be hoped that, whatever other changes the Bill undergoes in the course of the recasting to which its author has undertaken to subject it, the protection of this class of animals will not be forgotten. It may be remembered that in recent cases of atrocious cruelty to these beasts the defence has been set up that they are unprotected by the existing Acts. Protection ought certainly to be given, though it may be a question for those concerned whether it should be given in this form or independently.

The balance of opinion, alike in the debate and in the division, was overwhelmingly against the form of sport primarily attacked by the Bill. The ladies whose amiable wish to heighten by their presence the attractions of Hurlingham has made Hurlingham a place of fashionable resort must be a little ashamed to find how little sympathy sportsmen who deserve the name have with the spectacle they have either learned or pretended to enjoy. It certainly cannot raise a woman in her own esteem to be associated with a pastime which is compounded in

about equal parts of cruelty and gambling, and it is not likely to raise her in the esteem of those whose good opinion she values more than her own. Even the speakers against the Bill usually qualified their opposition with a disclaimer of any tenderness for pigeon-shooting itself. Indeed, after the letter from Sir FREDERICK MILBANK which Mr. ANDERSON read to the House, it would have argued some courage or much obtuseness to have taken any other line. "It is well known," he writes, "that the whole of the old school have left off shooting at pigeons on account of its having got into the hands of professional pigeon-shooters, who do not shoot for the so-called sport, but for making money." Wherever money-making and sport get mixed up, the partnership is sure to be extended to rascality of all sorts. The trapper is either himself interested in the result of the match, or is in the pay of some one who has money depending on it; and, according as he or his employer has backed the gun or the bird, he decides whether to stimulate the flight of the pigeon by pain, or to check it by mutilation. The argument upon which most reliance was placed was the alleged resemblance between pigeon-shooting and pheasant-shooting, and it is greatly to be regretted that the recent taste for battues has given but too much force to this analogy. But, though to shoot pheasants tame enough to eat out of the hand is but a low form of sport, it is not cruel in the sense in which pigeon-shooting is cruel. The pheasant is not prepared for the slaughter by any of the ingenious forms of torture which Mr. ANDERSON described; it runs the same risks and has the same chances that it would have if it were genuinely wild. There is no doubt, however, that the modern tendency to deprive sport as far as possible both of hardship and uncertainty is likely, if it goes on, to bring forms of sport which formerly were not open to objection within the lines of any adequate law against cruelty. This consideration supplies no argument in favour of pigeon-shooting; it only suggests a warning to those who may have it in their power to prevent the gradual deterioration to which, by a curious contradiction, sport seems more and more exposed as civilization advances. We do not deny that it is not easy to draw a perfectly satisfactory line of demarcation between sports which ought to be forbidden and sports which ought to be permitted. There are two characteristics the presence of which should undoubtedly exempt sport from the interference of the law; the difficulty begins when one of these characteristics is present but not the other. Sport, in the true acceptance of the term, is the slaughter of wild animals under conditions which develop bodily strength and endurance, and mental activity and resource. In proportion as a sport answers to this description it is one which deserves encouragement. Now pigeon-shooting offends against both parts of this canon. It is the slaughter of tame animals carried on under conditions which develop no qualities, mental or bodily, except quickness of eye and steadiness of hand. It fails therefore to show any reason why exception should be made in its favour.

Nor, we confess, are we any more favourably disposed towards coursing with trapped hares. It may be true that the wild hare suffers at least as much as the hare that is first caught and is then let loose in a confined area where its span of life is usually a remarkably short one. But the hunting of wild animals, even of wild animals as timid and inoffensive as the hare, is the survival of an instinct too deeply seated in mankind to make it possible or expedient to uproot it. The form of that instinct which finds gratification in paying to have wild animals caught for you in the first instance, and then turned out before the dogs under conditions which make their escape almost impossible, is at the best a very debased one. It is when we come to the case of the carted deer that the difficulty really begins. As regards one part of the rule above given, there is no doubt of its applicability. The deer is an animal kept in confinement and occasionally brought out for the purpose of being hunted. On the other hand, the bodily and mental gains derivable from stag-hunting are identical, or nearly so, with those derivable from fox-hunting. There is the same healthy excitement to be found in it; it is not open, as pigeon-shooting is, to the charge of encouraging additional acts of cruelty in the course of making the deer ready for the hunt; and it is wholly unconnected with gambling. Putting these things together, we are disposed to think that Mr. ANDERSON will be wise to recast his Bill, and to

include in it an express exception in favour of stag-hunting. If the majority of the House were likely to be of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL's opinion that it should be made illegal to keep an animal in captivity in order to pursue it over and over again, there would be no objection to Mr. ANDERSON's Bill even in its entirety. But it is useless in legislation of this kind to go far ahead of public opinion, and it is by no means certain that to forbid stag-hunting would not be to commit this error. The argument that those who hunt with the QUEEN's Buckhounds are only counterjumpers is curiously beside the question. Indeed it is more than beside it; for, so long as stag-hunting calls out the same qualities as fox-hunting, it is a positive argument in its favour that it is enjoyed by a class of persons to whom this advantage would otherwise be denied. The popularity of a sport makes it all the more worthy of encouragement provided that the reasons which make it popular are in themselves good. The vice of pigeon-shooting is, that the reasons which make it popular are in themselves bad. Mr. ANDERSON may be congratulated in the remarkable growth in public opinion which is shown by the figures of the division, and by the fact that on a Wednesday he was able to take a division at all.

INDIAN CRIMINAL PROCEDURE.

THE importance of the question of Mr. ILBERT's alterations in Indian criminal procedure increases with every telegram from India and every announcement of the attitude of the Home Government. If it be true that the latter have to a certain extent committed themselves, all that can be said is the sooner they uncommit themselves the better. The delay of the final decision till November is unintelligible, except as giving time for reconsideration of the question. What the result of that reconsideration ought to be is indicated not so much by the mere reports of the feeling excited in India, though no doubt great weight ought to be assigned to that feeling, as by the examination of the arguments put forward on one and the other side in England. It is a plausible request, no doubt, to "wait for the explanatory correspondence." But until it is shown what the correspondence has to explain the request can hardly be taken as anything but equivalent to a plea for a long day. It is not argued, it cannot be argued, that there is anything in the proposal arising from circumstances so recent that they are not in possession of the English public, or even of the distinguished Indian civilians and jurists who have retired from Indian service. No defender of Lord RIFON urges that his proposal has been misunderstood; no opponent of that proposal contends that its immediate and direct, as distinguished from its ultimate and indirect, effect will be great or far-ranging. Indeed it would be impossible for those who affect the RIFON-ILBERT policy to accuse those who do not affect it of exaggeration, because by so doing they would furnish an argument against themselves. If the change proposed is in effect so trifling, it is clearly not worth while to offend the whole European population of India, with the exception of a few doctrinaire officials, in order to carry it. Accordingly little is heard directly of any exaggeration on the part of those who take the European side, and complaints of inaccuracy on their part are almost limited to the convenient but vague demand for suspension of judgment. But the arguments which are brought forward are as significant as those which are eschewed. Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, writing to the *Times* avowedly to neutralize the effect of Sir JAMES STEPHEN's letter, has literally nothing to say but that Sir JAMES STEPHEN is "a sort of thick and 'thin apologist of Lord LYTTON'; that the question is nearly the same as that on which he, Sir GEORGE, voted ten years ago; that he did not quite know which way to vote, but decided to adopt 'the more liberal view,' and that for his own part he should not have thought it worth reopening at all. If this is all that Mr. ILBERT and Lord RIFON can get their English supporters to say for them, the old Norse phrase, "Bare are their backs," certainly applies. That Mr. Justice STEPHEN is an apologist of Lord LYTTON, that the question is really one of no importance at all, and that the RIFON view is the more liberal view—this is all that its only non-official advocate of high station in this country has yet been able to say for it.

The contrast between this remarkable letter and the

letter which appeared side by side with it over the signature of Sir LOUIS JACKSON is so great as to be almost ludicrous; but it cannot be too often repeated that to settle such a question as this by merely counting and balancing the affidavits from witnesses of authority is mischievous in principle and unnecessary in practice. In questions where the facts are complicated, obscure, and known to few, it is advisable to decide by authority. But the facts here are of an entirely different character. It is obvious to any one—it is indeed not denied by Lord RIPPON's defenders—that the measure which has excited so much heartburning is a question of principle, a question of "taking the wishes and needs of the native population into account." "Needs" is, of course, here a question-begging word; for it is not proved, it is hardly even pretended, that the ends of justice can be attained in no other way than by the proposed alteration. But if the phrase be amended to "taking the wishes of the native population into account," then it is perfectly easy and desirable to meet the enemy on that ground. It is a very well-known ground—it may be said to be at the present time the Belgium, the political cockpit, of the continent of politics. The Irish main which is still being fought out on it ought to be sufficiently full of instruction to the most unintelligent looker-on. Yet the cases of Ireland and India, though alike in respect of the recklessness with which the doctrinaires apply their doctrine, are in many ways dissimilar. England has to govern Ireland because she cannot help it—because an inscrutable Providence has made it inevitable geographically and historically. But it is not inevitable, geographically or historically, that England should govern India. The task has been deliberately, if gradually, undertaken on the sole principle of the right of the strongest, and the minor principles flowing from this initial position penetrate every branch of the Indian political question. To adopt such a principle as the doctrinaires would have England adopt—a principle from which this particular measure is described by themselves as an unimportant but convenient deduction—is practically to declare the title-deeds of India invalid. If such a consideration seems too abstract and theoretic, these epithets certainly cannot be applied to another which may be easily stated. To hold India, and at the same time to disconcert the minds, weaken the prestige, and discredit the position of those by whom England holds it, is the conduct of simpletons. The threats of resignation on the part of volunteers, of insubordination on the part of the military, may be exaggerated, improper, or unwise. Yet they express in an exaggerated, improper, and unwise manner the decision of an instinct which is not likely to go far wrong as to the effect of the proposal.

The entertainment of that proposal by the Home Government is all the more singular in that it cannot be attributed to any blind deference to the opinion of the Government of India. The documents which have been extracted from Lord HARTINGTON's reluctance as to the discharge of the expenses of the Indian Contingent in Egypt prove this beyond all question. It is impossible for the much talked of explanatory Correspondence to urge the extension of the jurisdiction of native magistrates more strongly than this Correspondence deprecated the levying of the expenses of the Egyptian war on India. Lord RIPPON and his colleagues can scarcely be more certain that "the interests of HER MAJESTY's Indian subjects" require the equalization of native and European privilege (with a difference left in favour of the native) than they were that the interests of HER MAJESTY's Indian subjects neither required nor were chargeable with any such expenditure as that on the favourite child of Mr. GLADSTONE's old age, the Egyptian expedition. These protests were ignored except partially and grudgingly; but the suggestions of Lord RIPPON as to criminal procedure seem to have met with a perfectly favourable hearing. Yet, putting the opinion of the Indian Government aside in each case, it might surely seem that this proceeding of HER MAJESTY's Government should on the face of it, and looking merely at the interests of HER MAJESTY's Indian subjects, have been reversed. There is no doubt that in any case it is the interest of a nation of taxpayers to escape the payment of a heavy bill. There is no doubt that the finances of India in particular, though very far from being in the unhealthy state in which some fanatics believe them to be, are in a condition which ought not to be over-taxed. It is impossible for any honest politician, from the wildest of Jingoes to the tamest member of the Peace Society, to deny that the Indian interests

involved in the Egyptian expedition were the interests of the English dominion in India. Therefore, by an irrefragable process of logic, it is clear that HER MAJESTY's Government regard the importance of the English dominion in India as so great and paramount that a heavy charge must be imposed on the Indian subjects of HER MAJESTY despite the protest of the responsible governors of those subjects. Yet, on the other hand, they regard the importance of the English dominion in India as so slight that an alteration in criminal procedure—admitted on all sides to be of small immediate effect, but alleged on the strongest reasons to be likely to prove detrimental to the foundations of that dominion—is to be allowed on the mere recommendation of the Indian Government of the day. These things are hard to reconcile; but it is perhaps scarcely a novelty to find fanatical amateurs of political symmetry in theory committing themselves in practice to the grossest anomalies.

THE CATTLE QUESTION.

THE meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture on Tuesday foreshadows a hitch in the Ministerial programme of conciliating the farmers by means of changes in the land system. While questions of entail and settlement, of tenant-right and compensation for improvements, are under discussion, cattle disease is spreading and completing the ruin which bad seasons and American competition have begun. The Government are quite willing to legislate in the former direction. A Land Bill pleases a large number of their supporters who have nothing to do with land, and are only interested in the political and social consequences which they suppose likely to follow from dealing with it in a proper spirit. The prevention of cattle disease has no similar interest for them. In theory indeed they have lately become warm advocates of all measures which have for their object the benefit of the farmer; but in practice this disposition of theirs is limited by a universal and easily understood law. The farmer must be benefitted at the expense of the landlord. The genuine Radical reverses the feeling of WORDSWORTH'S "wiser mind," and cares less for what a Land Bill leaves behind than for what it takes away. The only condition on which he can put up with the farmer's gain is that it shall be identical with the landlord's loss. Legislation directed against cattle disease is necessarily wanting in this first element of political soundness. The fewer cattle the farmer loses the better able he will be to pay his rent. This is plainly not the way to break down the landed interest. It is well that farmer and landlord should find their level, but it must be found in a common ruin. Yet if this spirit is allowed to influence the character of the anticipated legislation for the farmer's advantage it is possible that it may altogether miss another purpose, which, in the minds of its authors, is of even more immediate importance than that of revolutionizing the existing land system. This secondary but most pressing object is the detachment of the agricultural vote from the Conservatives. The hope of the Ministerialists is so to please the farmers by improvements in the conditions of their tenure as to make sure of their support for the Liberal candidates in the counties at the next general election. It is true that this is only a second string to their bow, the first being the virtual suppression of the farmer's vote by that of the newly enfranchised labourers. Circumstances however may make it impossible to carry the County Franchise Bill in time for the next election, or the labourer may prove a less docile person than his political friends expect; and in either case the farmer's vote may be exceedingly useful. But if the prevention of cattle disease becomes for the time the question that most interests the farmer, he may insist upon having something done for him in this way. Left to themselves the Government would probably be quite willing to give him a large part of what he asks. Some of them are large owners of grazing land, and so have a more practical knowledge of the importance of keeping out disease than can be expected from men whose acquaintance with the meat supply begins in the butcher's shop. But the protection of cattle from contagion is identified in the minds of many of their supporters with Protection, with class legislation, with the subordination of all other interests to the land, and generally with Toryism in its worst forms. Thus the Government may not improbably find themselves in a difficulty from which

even the most astute party management may fail to extricate them.

If the question is looked at under the influence of somewhat larger considerations, it will be seen to be above all things a consumers' question. When the opponents of further legislation against cattle disease say that what we want to know is not how this legislation will affect the farmers, but how it will affect the community; not whether it will give the meat-grower healthy cattle, but whether it will give the meat-eater cheap meat, we are disposed to agree with them. The point which it is really important to settle is by what means this cheap meat can be best obtained. No doubt the argument in favour of doing as little as possible to check importation is in itself a plausible one. Perhaps it derives its strength from a half-unconscious analogy with the supply of grain. If foreign wheat were found to be often infected with a disease which could be communicated to home-grown wheat, the farmers would no doubt ask for protection against the importation of diseased wheat; and, if this could only be obtained by prohibiting the importation of wheat from any countries in which the disease had shown itself, they might even contend that this prohibition ought to be imposed. From the farmer's point of view the analogy with the laws already in force against cattle disease would be complete; yet the interest of the consumer would make it impossible to listen to any such proposal. Why then is it not equally impossible to impose such a prohibition on the importation of cattle? For the very sufficient reason that the relative proportions of home-grown cattle and imported cattle are altogether different from the relative proportions of home-grown wheat and imported wheat. We get by far the larger part of our wheat supply from foreign countries, and the price of the wheat we grow at home is entirely determined by the price at which imported wheat can be sold in the English markets. By keeping out foreign wheat in order to benefit home-grown wheat, we should be sacrificing the greater to the less. The more thoroughly the end was achieved the dearer bread would become. On the other hand, we get by far the larger part of our meat supply from our own country, and as yet the price at which foreign meat can be imported has but an infinitesimal part in determining the price of meat raised at home. Consequently it is of paramount importance to the consumer that the supply of home-grown cattle shall be abundant. If that supply were cut off, meat would rise to famine prices, in spite of all that the cattle importer could do for us. Whether this will always be so is another question altogether. Future improvements in the arrangements under which live cattle are brought to this country may make the consumer as careless about the supply of home-grown meat as he already is about the supply of home-grown grain. But that time has not come yet, nor are the signs of its approach at all evident. If the meat trade is revolutionized, it will probably be by improvements in the processes by which meat killed in foreign countries is preserved for use here. If these improvements should make us really independent of home-grown meat, there would be no need to repeal the laws against the importation of live cattle. They would practically repeal themselves, since there would be no more live cattle imported. Already the value of the dead meat imported is about 16,000,000*l.*, while that of the live stock is little more than half that sum. If the importation of live cattle were entirely forbidden, it is only a very small fraction of the total meat supply that would be interfered with.

The speeches at the meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture showed a praiseworthy appreciation of this side of the subject. Cattle-growers are pardonably anxious to live, but they have come to understand that the only way in which they can now expect to live is by proving that they are of use to the community. When we hear of villages where sheep were formerly to be bought at sixpence a pound, we can readily believe that every pound of meat imported from abroad has prevented the production in this country of at least two pounds. The process by which cattle disease is spread is disagreeably uniform. It is found to be very prevalent, and vigorous measures are taken to get rid of it. It is stamped out at home, and its possible importation from abroad is very closely watched. But when the victory is won these precautions are at once relaxed. In spite of the vigilance of inspectors, diseased cattle find their way from abroad into the London markets, and from the London markets they are distributed

throughout the country. So long as importation is allowed from countries in which disease exists, there is no means of effectually guarding against this danger. In almost every case the attention of the Privy Council is called to the probability of a fresh importation of disease by the discovery that it has already been imported. When that discovery is made it is too late to take measures to protect the farmer; all that can be hoped for is his deliverance. The war has to be waged in our own country instead of in the enemy's. As the Chamber of Agriculture intend to send a deputation to the PRIME MINISTER shortly after Easter, they will do well in the meantime to arm themselves with all the evidence that can be got together as to the effect of disease upon the amount and value of the home-grown element in the meat market.

BATH.

A GREAT work remains to be written on the rise, progress, and decline of certain of our once famous watering-places. We should confidently predict for it a complete success if the right man were forthcoming in one familiarly acquainted with the society and manners of the past, gifted with a brilliant style, and a vividly dramatic imagination. For the interest of those watering-places is mainly social, as we are reminded to our cost when we go for information or entertainment to the laboriously conscientious descriptions in the guide-books. We do not care in the least for industrious archaeological research, or for the portentous statistics of the gallons of water which daily burst from the fountains and run to waste. With the exception of the confirmed invalids—and in most cases they are an insignificant minority of the visitors now-a-days—we are all profoundly indifferent to scientific analysis, or to the average temperature where the waters are warm. We desire to hear nothing of the precise amount of salts or chlorides in solution, or of the presence of so many grains of iron in what Mr. John Smauker called the "killibeat." We are persuaded beforehand that visitors of well-regulated minds will find remarkable Roman brickwork to delight them, for that wonderful people have left their memorials everywhere, either above the ground or beneath it. Whether they were stationed in the British swamps or in the German forests, the legionaries afflicted with fevers and malarial seem to have scented out almost every spring which has become popular in this nineteenth century. What does interest us is the comparatively recent associations of these places with the forefathers of our own in the last two or three hundred years, who took the ladies of their families to the waters for distraction, or who went in personally for relief from their ailments or from severe political strain. Our baths, if we could arrive at their half-forgotten history, are closely associated with the half-forgotten queens of our drawing-rooms; with the beauties who were toasts in their time, and the causes of innumerable single combats; with the politicians who made contemporary history; with the fine gentlemen who set contemporary fashions; and with the literary men whose genius shed a lustre on their times. Our novelists have done something in that way, although not very much, since they necessarily treated these matters incidentally. We have heard something of the baths from Fielding, and more from Smollett; while Tunbridge Wells have been more lately treated by Thackeray in his *Virginians*, and Epsom Spa by Messrs. Besant and Rice in their very clever *Chaplain of the Fleet*. And we venture to say that nothing in any of those novels was more taking than the chapters on society at the baths. We may add that any work on the subject would have all the interest of social archaeology. For we fear that hotel-keepers and householders have been coming to the conclusion that the day of our English watering-places is practically past. We are aware that some of them have still a considerable amount of patronage, and may probably long continue to enjoy it. Buxton, for example, and other of the Derbyshire spas, attract a respectable concourse of clients through their comparatively short seasons. There are many worthy English folks who dread or detest Continental travel; while gout and rheumatism are crippling complaints, which indispose their victims to anything but the most indispensable exertions. Nevertheless, the days of our historical baths are gone by, so far as attracting anything like a body of pleasure-seekers is concerned. The close of Napoleon's wars, which opened the Continent again to tourists, did the English watering-places irremediable harm, while the general development of railways turned depression into rapid decline. Nowadays the *malades imaginaires* and those who are but slightly indisposed set their faces by preference towards the Continent. They, and the ladies of their families who go to nurse them, naturally choose a more absolute change of scene. Our fashionable physicians, with exceptional unanimity, consult the probable inclinations of their patients. While setting aside as a minor consideration the respective merits of different waters, it is certain that the question of economy need hardly be taken into account. Continental hotels are cheaper than our English establishments, except possibly in such a resort of our society as Homburg; we may live decidedly more moderately in respectable lodgings abroad; so that, should you decide for a course of any of the nearer foreign springs, you

may go far towards economizing your travelling expenses. We have suggested some probable reasons for indisputable results. Look at those changes at the baths which in some instances are of such old standing that existing inhabitants have ceased to lament them. Epsom, which more than a century ago was deserted as a watering-place, has been saved from social extinction by the Derby and the Downs; but neither owner nor overworked trainer, jockey, nor jockey, ever dreams of paying a visit to the common with the lonely fountains which precipitated the potent Epsom Salts. The "Pantiles" at Tunbridge Wells, with the tiled pavements and quaint arcades, are still as picturesque a bit of architecture as any in the south of England; but on many visits to them it has never been our fortune to see a single enthusiast refreshing himself at the "Wells."

We confess that the Bath Pump-room has been more fortunate than either Tunbridge Wells or Epsom, although it was a recent visit to Bath that suggested our present remarks. Still, even at Bath, relatively flourishing as it is, we may find ample matter for melancholy retrospect. We imagine that the city is still decently well-to-do; but the waters appear to be decidedly at a discount. We looked in at the Pump-room precisely at the hour when Mr. Cyrus Bantam met Mr. Pickwick and his friends by appointment, that the party of distinguished strangers might give their autographs to his golden book. At that hour a solitary elderly gentleman was sipping his scalding draught at the marble counter, while a more helpless invalid reclining in a chair was looking on at the proceeding with languid interest. We do not doubt that there must be a considerable number of patients assembled in the town to take the baths; but we have reason to know that there is no such run on these establishments as at Wildbad, for example, where you must make your bathing arrangements for days in advance, and pay the penalty of unpunctuality by missing your turn. But, if Bath can no longer boast of the influx of invalids and visitors that gives one the impression of a short and brilliant season, it is always likely to be thriving, thanks to the attractions which are altogether independent of its springs. It is picturesquely situated and handsomely built. There is no need to build with bricks that turn in our climate to sad-coloured tints, superinducing hypochondria by the sense of funeral sympathy. The Bath-stone lies in convenient and inexhaustible quarries only covered by the thinnest possible layers of soil, and Nature has spared the masons a labour by shaping it into blocks all ready to their hands. Crescents and terraces rise, tier over tier, on hills that have every variety of aspect. Those who like an invigorating atmosphere may live many hundred feet above the sea-level in houses facing full to the east, while others who love to be sheltered may settle in the bottom of some valley where nothing short of a cyclone can disturb the air. In the one case the views are wide and imposing; in the other, you have generally an enchanting foreground of verdant turf and luxuriant foliage. The houses, having been built in Bath's palmy days, must be almost irreproachable in points of roominess and ample accommodation. And, although we did not take the opportunity of interviewing the house agents, we presume that they are to be had upon reasonable terms, judging from the relative quiet of the streets and the number of tickets in the windows. So that Bath seems to be just the place for men of moderate means who must sacrifice themselves to their overgrown families; or for valetudinarians who amuse themselves with their maladies, and are recommended quiet society. There is a good deal of mild gaiety and of easy-going hospitality; and a matron who, like Mrs. Colonel Wrigsby in *Pickwick*, is embarrassed with marriageable daughters, may hope to dispose of her girls not inelastically. We should imagine, too, that an Indian civilian would find himself in his element; or a retired officer with comfortable private means; or widows and spinsters with a weakness for whist, and the lingering sentiment that might warm into flirtation.

The practical objection to the place, so far as its chief patrons are concerned, seems to be the unparalleled steepness of the picturesque streets. It is really a kettle with an extremely contracted bottom, and the fashionable world hangs on by its eyelids to the precipitous sides. Even a stalwart Alpine Club man with a touch of natural indolence might hesitate before quartering himself in one of the upper terraces. The carriage roads sweep downwards on steep inclines, while the short cuts or staircases that serve for footpaths are eminently suggestive of sprained ankles. It is painful to see a failing veteran toiling painfully up those tremendous heights to his eyrie, where the prospect of coming down again must surely shape itself into nightmares; portly ladies who waddle comfortably along on the level pause and lay their hands on their sides when they begin to climb, in a manner that is eloquently suggestive of stitches; and we need hardly add that the town and its neighbourhood are the very purgatory of fly-horses. There are charming drives in all directions. But their pleasures are spoiled to the merciful man by the pressure upon the unlucky animal that is drawing him; though there is this to be said in apology for the flyman, that if the horse were not pushed both up and down hill, the excursions could only be carried out at a foot-pace. Consequently also, among all those ups and downs, the Bath chairs appear to be almost as much out of place in the city of their origin as Hansom cabs would be—a fact which does all the more credit to the audacity of their inventor's genius.

In our hasty sketch it only remains to say a word as to the few persons who really go for a course of the baths or the waters. We

should suppose that the spots to study them to the best advantage are the hotels immediately surrounding the Pump-room. For it is clear that an unfortunate who can hardly hobble cannot well come down from the comfortable private houses on the heights for each separate immersion. And if you desire to inform yourself as to the habits and hopes of the patients, you had best drop into an hotel smoking-room after dinner. For tobacco is not forbidden; aerated waters are beneficial rather than otherwise; and even a modicum of Scotch whisky is permitted. Easy-chairs in the smoking-rooms are somewhat out of favour, since there is a serious difficulty in getting out of them. The more unlucky of the victims have a couple of crutches within reach, and keep a suspicious eye on the stranger who may inconsiderately shift their props. The brightly gentlemen who are more slightly affected content themselves with a single substantial walking-stick. And, joking apart, you may witness a good deal of quiet heroism in some sufferer who pluckily keeps his spirits up in company, but who draws long breaths when nobody seems to be regarding him, and vents his misery in involuntary moans. In his weary eyes and wasted cheeks you may read the evidences of his restless days and sleepless nights. The talk may range over innumerable subjects—Shakspeare, politics, society, sport, and the musical glasses. But it invariably comes back to the points it started from—the waters, the baths, and their healing virtues, their miraculous cures and their inexplicable failures. Turn your ear as you will, you have practical illustration of the hope that springs eternal in the human breast; and it must be owned that many of the interlocutors have apparently given proof of their convictions by returning to "the Bath" again and again. We can say nothing personally as to its virtues; that is a question which invalids must discuss with the doctors. But we are sure that those who are sound in wind and limb will have no reason to regret a few days' sojourn in the prettily situated city of Prince Bladud, and it is an admirable centre besides for more distant excursions.

THE WADY SUDR MYSTERY.

IN spite of what has been said to the contrary by those who have merely glanced hurriedly at the Blue Book on the Palmer Expedition, a careful study of its pages leaves the question of Professor Palmer's murder as much of a Desert mystery as ever. Nobody of course doubts that he was murdered. With few exceptions nobody doubts that the enterprising ruffians who were hung at Zagazig the other day took part in the deed. But why Professor Palmer and his companions were killed is still very far from being clear—in fact the only thing the Blue Book does make plain is that those who planned and ordered the crime are still at large. It is true that Colonel Warren has worked very hard for the purpose of arresting them; indeed, the story of his labours is full of the pathetic interest which is generally associated with strenuous but fruitless endeavour. But that story may be summed up in a few words. At every point he was baffled just when he was getting within striking distance of his mark. On every line of search he tried he was allowed to proceed a certain distance—in fact, any distance—so long as he kept off the track of those who might implicate certain powerful Sheiks of the Nile Bedouins. By way, therefore, of covering Colonel Warren's failure to bring to justice the people primarily responsible for Professor Palmer's murder, a very extraordinary theory has been invented, and it has met with good deal of popular acceptance for many reasons. In the first place, it is a very convenient one for the Admiralty, who are apparently anxious that the Palmer expedition and the policy which led to its being organized should be forgotten as soon as possible. In the second place, it explains away "a mystery," and the bulk of newspaper readers dislike "unexplained mysteries." In the third place, it is simple and easily understood—a great thing in its favour with people who are too lazy to think for themselves, or too stupid to pick to pieces in their own minds the hasty generalizations of writers who have not taken time to master their facts. This theory, to which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman has given expression in the House of Commons, is that the attack on the expedition was only a casual wayside robbery, and that Mr. Palmer and his friends were murdered simply because ransom was not forthcoming.

There is hardly anybody familiar with the ways of the Desert who, no matter how hard he tries, can bring himself to accept such a strange hypothesis. It rests on no better proof than the brief report on pages 93 and 94 of the Blue Book of the "confessions" which were extorted from two of the murderers. One of these, Ali Showeyer, on being examined at Nakhl by Colonel Warren in December last, said:—"When Meter (Palmer's guide) refused to ransom them (Palmer, Charrington, and Gill) with money, our headmen decided to kill them." The other, Salem Abn Telheideb, said:—"We asked Meter for all the money, and said it was for us to take charge of the Christians. He refused to give the money. We then decided to kill the Christians." But none of the other murderers corroborate this story. The proposal to ransom the prisoners was discussed before a crowd of witnesses. Yet, though Colonel Warren, writing from Nakhl on the 3rd of January last, admits he has five of these in his hands, he does not seem to have examined them; or, if he has, he refrains from giving us a scrap of their evidence. That of itself rather shakes our belief in the ransom theory; but another consideration almost shatters it altogether. If nothing but money was in question, it is very hard to

understand how the leaders of the expedition lost their lives. Everybody knows that Palmer—whose adroitness in dealing with and whose power over Bedouins, even of the most predatory type, had often been put to proof—could have easily satisfied his captors. He could have guaranteed them more than they could have ever dreamt of getting by an exceptionally long and lucky career of brigandage. Then, if the murderers were so keenly bent on obtaining money, why, when (as two of them say) they knew Meter the guide had it, did they not seize him and extort it from him? One strong objection to the ransom theory is its inherent improbability. In this case every witness admits that the deed was the result of cool deliberation, and not a rash act done in a fit of furious passion. But surely, when a Bedouin wants ransom for a prisoner, he does not in cold blood "decide" to kill his captive without giving him a chance of sending to where he came from his ransom. The truth is that, so far from supporting the ransom theory, all the facts in the Blue Book point in quite another direction.

The object of Professor Palmer's expedition is now for the first time avowed, and it is absurd to suppose that it had nothing to do with the disaster that befel him and his comrades. He was furnished with a large sum of money to bribe as many Bedouins of Sinai as he thought necessary to patrol the Suez Canal and aid the Transport Service. He was to take Captain Gill part of the way on his road to cut the telegraph-wire between Cairo and Constantinople. He had in the month of July made what Mr. Campbell-Bannerman calls a "semi-secret" journey through the Desert and completed negotiations with the chief Sheikhs of the Sinaitic Peninsula, which led him to report to Lord Alcester that he could raise as many as fifty thousand Bedouins for our service. It is boldly asserted by the *Times* that Mr. Palmer misled the Government, because there are not more than five thousand people in the Desert in question. Such an assertion is very easily disposed of. Palmer was one of the best authorities living as to the Sinaitic Peninsula. In conjunction with Captain Gill, one of the ablest officers in the Intelligence Department, he arrived at his estimate. It is not likely that they both blundered badly; and it is certain, from passages in Gill's journals which have not yet been published, that he was so thoroughly convinced Palmer had made a right forecast that he not only strongly urged the authorities to let him have the money he wanted to enlist these Bedouin auxiliaries, but brought to Suez the authorization required to spend it. Moreover, if there are not more than five thousand people in the Desert, how does the *Times* account for this fact? It is stated on p. 23 of the Blue Book that one Sheikh alone—Salameh-el-Acry—who had promised to assist Arabi, refused to comply with his orders to send in four or five thousand men—a refusal which, it may be remarked in passing, has often been connected with Palmer's negotiations during his first journey. The more closely we examine the facts the clearer does the conviction grow that the whole of Mr. Palmer's work in detaching the Bedouins of Sinai from the Arabists had made him absolutely hateful to the rebel authorities at Cairo. The Governor of El Arish—Said Bey Mahomed, one of the bitterest and most bigoted of Arabi's partisans—issued orders that Palmer was to be brought in dead or alive. From the very day on which he began to organize his second mission he was watched by Arabi's spies. When he started from the Wells of Moses on the 9th of August one of these—Ali Showeyer—ran on ahead with a message from Salem Ibu Subbeh and Salem Sheweykh to certain Terrabins and Doubours, ordering them to give help in organizing an attack. This was managed, as we all know, and it was mainly carried out by Howetas, like the messenger Ali Showeyer. What we want to point out, however, is that the men who sent Ali Showeyer have never yet been laid hold of, and that no attempt seems to have been made to get at those who gave them their instructions. It is simply ridiculous, therefore, on Colonel Warren's own showing, to say that the truth is known, or that the Bedouins who were hanged the other day at Zagazig were the really responsible persons.

But what is most interesting and instructive in the Blue Book is the revelation of a secret sympathy between the Shedides of Cairo—the Sheikhs of the Nile Bedouins—and the men who not only organized, but participated in, the attack. These powerful chiefs turn out to be the head men of most of the murderers. They were fierce partisans of Arabi, and in close communication with the rebel authorities in Cairo. When the war was over they very nearly made everybody, including Colonel Warren himself, believe that the murder had been committed by the Towarahs, a tribe very friendly to Palmer, who had, however, incurred the enmity of the Arabists by refusing to take the field against the Khedive, and who it is now proved had nothing to do with the affair. Up to one point the Shedides did everything in their power to frustrate Colonel Warren's efforts to discover the murderers. When however Meter, Professor Palmer's guide, who came forward of his own accord to give evidence, told his story, they began to wince. He said he had offered ransom the day after his masters were seized, but the guards of Palmer and his companions would not take it, because they were promised a reward by Arabi's people for their Christian prisoners, and they added that, if they let them go, "the Government" might find them out. Meter told how he had discovered that Ali Showeyer had, known to the Shedides, carried the order to attack the expedition, and he suggested that those who gave him his instructions should be examined. He also said that pressure had been put on him by "the Government" (the Egyptian authorities) to hold his tongue. The only thing against Meter

is that some of the missing money is supposed to be in the possession of his family; but, even if he did cling to the money after he saw his masters murdered, and when he had no idea that any one else but the murderers might claim it (for it ought in justice to be said that those who killed Mr. Palmer and his friends took none of his money), we need not infer that he was one of the assassins. Of all those examined there is not one who has even given a hint that Meter betrayed the party. He had served Palmer most faithfully during his first journey. He knew that if he wanted to extort money there was for a man like him a much safer way of doing it than to kill the layer of the golden eggs. But Meter's evidence pointed suspicion sharply against the Shedides as acting in league with persons in authority in Cairo. Meter accordingly sickened very suddenly, was taken to the *native* hospital, and the *native* doctor forthwith reported that he died during the night. Colonel Warren afterwards abandoned the fruitless task of search to the most influential of these Shedides, who stipulated that nobody must go into the Desert to watch his work. He, the most powerful of those whose sole endeavour has been all along to prevent the truth being known, is therefore the man who is sent to reveal it. He, the man who is more than suspected of being an accomplice in, if not an instigator of, the murder, is despatched to "send in" the criminals. What is the consequence? We only get delivered up, for hanging purposes, those men who were so far kept in ignorance of the precise connexion of the Shedides with the plot that no "confession" they may make will implicate the Egyptian authorities or their agents. That is why the prisoners taken to Nakhl by the Shedides suddenly developed the "ransom theory," which cannot be proved for two reasons. Meter, whose cross-examination would have enabled us to test it, has suddenly sickened and died, after the usual manner of inconvenient witnesses in the East. No trusty witness who was present at the time when the proposal of ransom was discussed between Meter and the headmen, who ultimately "decided" to kill Palmer and his comrades, has been examined. That, at least, is the most charitable explanation which can be given of the strange absence from the Blue Book of any depositions bearing on this most important point—a point so important that, so long as the thinnest shadow of doubt hovers around it, nothing is settled.

MORE RAILWAY VANDALISM.

TO block up Victoria Street, and choke the Embankment and the Embankment gardens with oblong brick boxes breathing poisonous smoke; to build another red-brick box opposite the Egyptian Obelisk, and to balance that work of art with a tall red chimney; to ruin Westminster Abbey with sulphureous fumes; to cut up the *cursus* near Stonehenge, and turn Stonehenge into a tea-and-gin-garden; to run another railway into Epping Forest, and increase the number of "tea-and-gin-gardens" there; and to slice up Borrowdale and devastate Derwentwater in the interests of a slate quarry, are the latest efforts of British taste and enterprise. Some of these offences are already part of the stern logic of facts, others only await the facile assent of Parliament. The newspapers, the public, and Parliament itself are now awake to the consequences of this dangerous facility, as far as London is concerned. The Embankment is the chief and most beautiful of the roads in London. It is the only place in town outside of the Parks where a walk at once beautiful and healthy can be enjoyed. The view of the river, of the shipping, of the Houses of Parliament, is one that never lacks interest and variety, for it changes with every change of light and of atmosphere. The free air comes up the river from the sea, and no amount of traffic has hitherto been able to overcome the pleasant quiet of the riverside. The gardens, though not particularly pretty, are full of seats on which a City population does not disdain to repose, and are a capital playing-ground for London children. The very statues on the Embankment supply the element of humour which is so rarely absent from English sculpture.

To these charms of nature and art the Metropolitan District Railway Company has now been allowed to add its oblong yellow brick boxes. These have been hurried on, and are already sufficiently appalling in their cheap and squalid hideousness. That they interfere in some places with the traffic, that they are erected on public ground to the public prejudice, instead of on ground for which the Company pays a rent, are comparative trifles. Not till these holes have been made to communicate with the tunnels, and to belch forth their abominable smoke and steam, will the public quite appreciate the boon which is offered them by the Railway Company. That smoke destroys iron, destroys vegetation, and, when one happens to catch a sniff of it, nearly knocks down and asphyxiates the victim. For the delightful privilege of offending every sense, of obstructing the roadway, of destroying the gardens, and generally of advertising itself in the most offensive forms, the Railway Company is not to pay one penny. Nobody is to be punished but the public; no one is to benefit but the Company; there is to be no cost worth mentioning, except to the little of nature and art that London retains. A more exquisite example of the working of private legislation could not have been supplied to Mr. Sellar's recent argument against the present method of doing business. The Bill permitting the Railway Company to work its noble will on the Embankment was opposed by every body which could oppose it. The Metropolitan Board of Works and the Corporation of the City of London were against it. This

proves that a good deal more than the mere interests of taste and beauty were at stake. The Metropolitan Board of Works is responsible for the new red-brick box (an engine-house) and the expected tall brick chimney which is to balance the Obelisk. The Corporation of the City of London think that the Griffin (if it is a Griffin) adds artistic merit to the metropolis. When the City and Sir James McGarel Hogg are shocked by the ventilators, the ventilators must be something very remarkable indeed, and quite out of the common way in the direction of superfluous hideousness. The very Vestry of St. George's, Hanover Square, the Commissioners of Sewers even, were moved to oppose these abominable ventilators. But their opposition was of no avail. The ventilators were hideous, the ventilators were pernicious. It was proved that the railway could be ventilated in other ways; we have yet to learn whether the ventilators will ventilate the railway. Probably passengers will be suffocated neither more nor less than of old, while people who walk and drive in the open air will have to share their discomfort. But the apathy and indifference of Parliamentary Committees and that extraordinary power of fascination which Railway Companies exert have combined, and a new horror has been quietly added to the many offences of "the hideous town." Is there any hope? Probably not. The easy-going public will become accustomed to the new ugliness and discomfort. The wasted money of the ratepayers, the wasted beauty of the Embankment, will be forgotten. "The pace is too good to inquire" into anything but the prices of shares. The *Pall Mall Gazette* (which ought to know) says that "the President of the Board of Trade has promised that this matter shall be further looked into." The same paper says, with perfect truth, that no such audacious nuisance would be tolerated in a large town like Birmingham. Birmingham has been stirring itself in the matter of acquiring the Ashburnham Manuscripts, and sets an example in agreeable contrast to the bumptious and apathetic Philistinism of part of the London press. If the representative of Birmingham proves to be the *deus ex machina* who will rescue us from the ventilators, Birmingham and he will deserve gratitude which we cannot always offer them. In the meantime, a "Streets and Public Places Protection Committee" may be formed, and will certainly have plenty of labour ready to its hand. But can such a Committee hope to succeed where Corporations and Vestries, and Commissioners of Sewers, and Boards of Works have elaborately succeeded in failing?

The other railway projects to which we have referred are on a level, in point of aesthetic atrocity, with the outrages on the Embankment. One railway is anxious to run a line from Pewsey southwards through a sparsely inhabited country of downs and pastures. The advantage, if advantage there is to be, of this railway will accrue to a Company which is striving to compete with other Companies for the traffic of Bristol. The district is already well supplied with means for getting from the west to Southampton. But none of the existing railways damages and defaces the neighbourhood of Stonehenge. This is an oversight of course, and will be remedied by the new railway when it is constructed. Stonehenge itself is set upon a hill; and we may doubt whether the ardour of vandalism will contrive to lead the railway right through the circle of stones. This does not seem to be contemplated for the present. But the *cursus*, as it is called, and the strange prehistoric or Roman earthworks all round Stonehenge would but for Sir John Lubbock's opposition have been adorned by the addition of a new earthwork in the shape of a railway embankment. This has been given up, and the promoters have kindly consented not to interfere with what they delightfully term "a racecourse quite out of repair and of no use now." But the spoiling of the neighbourhood and the facilitation of "tear-gardening" at Stonehenge are to go on. A station near Stonehenge, a tea-and-gin-garden among the ancient stones, may prove not unprofitable speculations. Bank-holiday makers will be able to lunch all over the place, to chip the monuments at pleasure, to leave greasy papers, orange peel, and broken bottles on the ground in the usual picturesque confusion. All this may be represented as contributing to the education of the People, and Railway Companies are known to be vastly interested in every philanthropic enterprise of that sort. The proposed new railway to Epping Forest is another piece of railway philanthropy. The Forest is already almost begirt with railways. No spot in those primeval solitudes is distant more than two miles from a railway station. The theory is that no East-end tourist can walk more than three hundred yards, and this enfeebled being must be philanthropically borne onwards in a railway carriage from tea-garden to tea-garden. It is also desirable to effect a junction with the Great Eastern main line. The new railway will bring new villas and new tea-gardens with it, and the Forest, which was to be kept as a piece of natural waste easily accessible from London, will be reduced to the primitive wildness of Hampstead Heath. The only comfort is that East-end 'Arry will not really penetrate many yards beyond the railway refreshment-room or the railway hotel. At Box Hill, for example, on a Bank Holiday, 'Arry does not wander far over the fair face of nature. He and his women collect and howl, and eat and drink in large groups, within very easy reach of the train which is to carry them back to London. There are already a number of stations close to Epping Forest where this rural felicity can be obtained, and it is difficult to see any good reason for adding to the number.

Some defence has recently been made for the proposed Braithwaite and Buttermere Railway. The object of this railway is to deface Derwentwater and Borrowdale in the interests of a certain

slate quarry at Honister. The Chairman of the Keswick and Cockermouth Railway recently expressed at a meeting of shareholders the simple commercial view of this pleasing enterprise. He said, if he was correctly reported, that there was but one question to be considered, "Will it bring grist to the mill?" There was here no hypocrisy, at all events, no humane pretence, no philanthropic pretence, no aesthetic pretence. "Will it bring grist to the mill?"—that is the only question. Borrowdale and Derwentwater exist for the purpose of bringing grist to the mill of the Keswick and Cockermouth Railway. But it seems that more philanthropic, humane, and aesthetic reasons for running this railway have been advanced by Mr. Waugh, M.P. They are quoted and confuted by Mr. H. D. Rawnsley, in a letter addressed to the *Manchester Guardian* and other journals. We have only Mr. Rawnsley's version of Mr. Waugh's arguments, but we have other arguments of the other friends of the proposed railway. First for the aesthetic reason; the slates from Honister quarry have "a peculiar tint of green," and the more houses that are roofed with them the greater will be "the beauty of the landscape." There must be a "peculiar tint of green" in the character of people who are moved by this truly comic argument. So eager to promote landscape beauty are the friends of Honister Quarry that they will actually run a railway through Borrowdale for that laudable purpose. Also for the purpose of bringing "grist to the mill." The philanthropic and humane argument is that "long strings of jaded and miserable animals" now obstruct the roads, and horrify the gentle tourist by their agony as they drag the slates from the quarry. Mr. Rawnsley says that precisely nine horses and forty quarrymen are employed by the Quarry Company, and that the local Secretary for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has observed but two cases of sore back in three years in those long strings of nine faded and miserable animals. The Quarry Company also threaten the district with traction engines if they are refused their railway, and they add that the railway will "yield a return for the capital invested in the quarries, which are leased from Lord Leconfield." So, it appears, stands the case for this highly uncalled-for addition to the charm of Derwentwater. "A return for the capital invested" and "grist for the mill" are of course the real motives; but the beauty of green slates and the sufferings of the faded and miserable nags appeal more strongly to the heart of the man of feeling.

A LEADING-STRING FOR OUR MASTERS.

THE House of Lords has a growing desire to keep the sovereign people in the straight path. It fully agrees with the opinion expressed by Lord Cairns in the course of Tuesday night's debate that much of everybody's virtue depends on the absence of temptation, and that nothing will keep men from going wrong so effectually as the impossibility of doing so. Sunday Closing Bills are generally found to be approved by Lord-Lieutenants and such considerable persons as are in no need to depend on the public-house for their beer. With the excellent object of protecting young women from the cramps of Continental brothels, a Committee largely composed of peers lately proposed a scheme of inspection which would have commended itself to the Parliaments of the Commonwealth. It is perhaps not yet forgotten that they have carried their paternal activity into other spheres, and have strenuously endeavoured to save the members of the Universities from wasting their youth by trying to suppress what they were pleased to call idle Fellowships. These exertions have not been so successful as the friends of virtue by line and rule could desire; but the House of Lords is not weary in well-doing. It perseveres, and has begun the mild labours of its Session by voting the second reading of a Bill with a title nearly as long as a preamble, which is to inconvenience the smaller class of employers of labour in the interest of that pet of the philanthropist—the drunkard.

This measure, which is called the Payment of Wages in Public-houses Prohibition Bill, is not before their Lordships' House for the first time. It passed the second reading last Session, but was buried along with much else under the ruins of the Government's Irish policy. It is now brought forward with better chances of success. The state of things which the Bill is designed to remedy will be new to many of the public. We are all familiar enough with the picture of workmen's wives standing at the doors of gin-palaces on Saturday nights waiting for their husbands to come out with as much of their wages as has escaped the till. It had not been widely known that the presence of the men in the public-house was not in all cases voluntary. If they went there at all, it was supposed that they did so exclusively for the sake of the drink. From the speech of Earl Stanhope, who moved the second reading of the Bill, it will be seen that they sometimes have no choice, as it is the custom with some employers of labour in brickyards, dockyards, and dust-yards to pay their men in public-houses. This is the practice which the Bill is designed to make illegal. The arguments by which it is supported are of a sufficiently familiar kind. Indeed there is but one argument brought forward. Being paid in a tavern puts so many temptations to drink in the workman's way that he cannot resist them. Earl Stanhope draws a most shocking picture of what happens in such places on a Saturday night. The men not only waste their small substance on drink. They lose great part of it in consequence of being drunk. He had

been assured that "as much as 7*l.* or 8*l.* was frequently picked up on the closing of a public-house, the men having become unable through drink to discriminate between gold and copper." The colouring here is probably a little heightened. The men who are paid in this way are not the skilled workmen in great factories, whose wages are fairly good. They are the labourers who earn scanty and precarious wages in yards of different kinds, and who can scarcely earn more than a pound a week in the best of times. According to the Earl of Shaftesbury, who is only too well supported by other evidence, their average earnings are not more than nine shillings a week all the year round. It would require a large number of drunken men of this class to lose 7*l.* or 8*l.* among them by mere tipsy oversight. It is, however, only too probable that too much of what miserable wages they do earn is lost or fuddled away as soon as it is got. It is also only too probable that undue advantage is taken of their weakness and of the opportunities which this system of payment affords by people who have an interest in misleading them. The statement of the Earl of Shaftesbury, who is naturally a supporter of the Bill, that the foremen who pay the wages are occasionally part owners of the public-houses in which they are paid, is doubtless well founded. Where that is the case no effort will of course be spared to tempt the men to drink "for the good of the house." In order to save them from this temptation, the Bill proposes to make the payment of wages in public-houses illegal. The fifty-eight peers who voted for the second reading are obviously of opinion that, if the men are no longer paid in the immediate neighbourhood of the bar, they are much less likely to go near it at all.

It is no doubt greatly to be desired that workmen should go less to the taproom than they do, but it is very doubtful whether this well-intentioned Bill would do the good its promoters design. The weak point of all measures of this kind is that they inflict a certain inconvenience for the sake of trying to attain a very uncertain good. The employers are entitled to some consideration as well as the workmen, and if this Bill becomes law they will often be put to considerable inconvenience. The foremen and contractors who undertake the work of dockyards and dustyards do not possess large establishments and offices; otherwise they would be under no necessity to choose public-houses to pay their wages in. If they are suddenly shut out from these places they must find others. Some loss will also be inflicted on the taverns, some of which are said to be supported mainly by this system. As far, however, as their loss would only mean the removal of a scandal and put a stop to a certain amount of coarse bacchanalia it is not to be greatly lamented. The owner of a public-house which exists to encourage disorder is not in a more respectable position than the owner of an unhealthy dwelling-place; and such persons receive as a rule not less, but more, consideration than they are entitled to. The case of the employers is much more worthy of sympathy; and they have good cause to complain if Parliament inflicts on them an uncompensated loss. The main objection to the Bill, however, is not its interference either with the foremen or the publicans. If a clear case of abuse can be made out, no vested right should be allowed to stand in the way of its abolition. But the truth is that no such case has been made out. The Bill is only one more of the many fussy philanthropic interferences with freedom of contract which are so dear to people who have apparently concentrated their attention on the drunkard and can see nobody else. It does not even appear that any serious attempt to collect evidence has been made by the promoters of the Bill. Lord Bramwell, who led the opposition to the second reading of the Bill, insisted on the one-sided character of the reasons given in support of it. He acknowledged that the practice of paying wages in public-houses might lead to abuse; but he pointed out, what the advocates of the Bill have very characteristically forgotten, that by making it in all cases illegal a serious evil might be inflicted. "No matter how convenient it might be to the man who paid and the man who received that wages should be paid in a public-house, and no matter how inconvenient it might be that wages should be paid elsewhere, their lordships were called upon to enact under a penalty that they should not be paid there." A variety of circumstances may easily be imagined in which the prohibition would be a cause of trouble. Gangs of men might be employed even by large contracting houses at a distance from their head office in places where an inn would be the only cover attainable. Many even of those who supported the second reading must have felt that the Bill as it stands is far too sweeping, and only gave their vote for it like Lord Cairns, with a distinct intention that it should be qualified in Committee. They accepted it with a vague notion that it was for the good of the working class, and with the lightness of heart of men who are not likely to be much affected by their meritorious support of virtue.

The most remarkable feature of this and many similar attempts to legislate for the good of the working class is this very conviction that the legislation is needed at all. We are very far from thinking that labourers who earn on an average nine shillings a week are in no need of guidance to keep them steady. But it is certainly remarkable that the opinion should be so strongly shared by the very people who think this class fit to be trusted with political power. All the public-house abolition Bills which tread on one another's heels in every Session of Parliament come from the Liberal side—from the party which has the profoundest belief in the virtues of "the people." These curious politicians are never weary of insisting on the superiority of their clients to the "society" at which a philosophic contemporary sneers, and yet they cannot trust them within sight of a tap. These

extremely moral and high-minded labourers are so miserably weak in the opinion of the very Radical members who appeal to their judgment that they must be kept out of the doors of the tavern. It would even appear from this Bill that they are not even credited with a native taste for beer. No clause has been inserted providing that, on receipt of their money, they shall be forthwith conducted home by a policeman, or put under the charge of the Salvation Army. There will be nothing but their own good sense to keep them out of the gin-palace if the Bill does become law. The promoters of this great saving measure seem absolutely to think that, if labourers are not led into a public-house by the ear so to speak, they will never enter it of their own accord. To people of a less trustful mind it will seem that the consequence of the Bill would be that, after a great deal of trouble had been caused to many respectable persons in the pursuit of their business, the drunkards would remain drunkards, and the sober men would be no better off than before. To attain this remarkable result, it is proposed to interfere yet further between employers and employed. The answers made to the members of the House of Lords who spoke against the Bill on the ground that it was an interference with freedom of contract were highly worthy of attention. Earl Stanhope had nothing to say, except that compulsory vaccination was an interference with the freedom of the subject, and one interference was as good as another. The Earl of Shaftesbury was quite ready to make laws to prevent anybody from over-eating or over-drinking himself. Earl Granville disposed of the whole contention in a most thoroughgoing way. It was, in his opinion, rather late in the day to talk of first steps. "Parliament, in amending the truck system, had seriously interfered with liberty of contract between grown-up persons, and it had done this on account of the abuses which grew up in a system capable, if properly conducted, of conferring great benefits on working people by securing them a better quality of goods at cheaper rates than were otherwise attainable." Translated into plain words, this means that because Parliament interfered with a proved and notorious abuse it may logically and beneficially strike in, for sentimental reasons, where no abuse has been proved to exist. Because the law has very properly put a stop, as far as it can, to crimping in seaports, therefore it may decide for every sailor what vessel he shall sail in, where he shall lodge, how much wages he shall take, and what he shall buy with them. The principle is one which Radical philanthropy is rapidly tending to make peculiarly its own, and the sooner and more clearly that is known to be the case the better.

ELEPHANTS.

ELEPHANTS are useful to geographers making maps of the interior of Africa. Apart from this, from the European point of view, the chief claim of the elephant to public notice is that he is very big, and that he does not use his size in an obnoxious way. This general basis of popularity being established, it has been found necessary to credit him with sagacity, for mere corporal bulk as a foundation of popular favour would, it is conceded, go but a short way towards justifying a benevolent attitude in regard to the elephant, and might almost imply a Philistine want of intellect on the part of the admirers. The Chinese, indeed, indiscriminately honour all fat men as personally carrying about with them a proof of their success in life, and, therefore, visible credentials of shrewdness and worldly wisdom. But we are not Chinamen, and it has consequently been discovered that elephants do not exhibit that crass stupidity which presumably might have been expected of mankind if they had been born in the shape of elephants. Elephants do not, indeed, carry umbrellas and bags in their mouths like dogs, nor is it recorded that they have ever used carts to pull roasted chestnuts out of the fire, nor has any elephant ever been known to speak like a parrot or a mima. It is possible, of course, that they refrain from human speech for the same reason that the monkeys do, because, if they talked, they would be immediately set to work for their living; but this is improbable, for, as it is, many elephants labour just as hard as if they had the eloquence of a navvy. But, if elephants do not distinguish themselves thus, it is notorious that if you prick them in the trunk with a needle, you will on the first eligible occasion afterwards be drenched with dirty water. If you incite an elephant to cross a bridge, he will first satisfy himself, by trying it with his forelegs, that its stability is all that you wish him to believe it to be. If you set him to pile logs in a timber-yard, he will take care that they are neatly laid one on the top of the other and not heaped up anyhow. He will carry children backwards and forwards on his back without being apparently any more wearied of the task than his keeper is. It is evident, therefore, that the elephant is sagacious. He is docile, and he is big. Therefore he is a popular favourite, and rewarded with buns.

But, barring the fact that they will carry children on their backs without bucking like an Australian "waler," and that they like buns, Westerns are in a deplorable state of ignorance about elephants. Beyond the fact that there are African elephants and Asiatic elephants, and that the Kings of Siam and Burma are very anxious to get possession of white specimens, little is known. Easterns have a far more appreciative view of the situation, and greater honour.

The huge earth-shaking beast,
The beast that hath between his eyes
The serpent for a hand.

Still they are not altogether indiscriminate in the regard they have for elephants. There are many varieties of the animal recognized which are altogether unknown to Western naturalists, and the literature on the subject is very voluminous and not to be mastered without very serious study. It is difficult to say, and it would be presumptuous in an outsider to decide, which of the two acknowledged text-books of the science is to be regarded as the better authority for those anxious to improve their knowledge of elephants—whether the *Tamra Xang*, the Treatise on the Elephant written by a Siamese nobleman at one time holding the office of Kromma Xang, or Imperial Marshal to the Royal (Siamese) White Elephant, or the Burmese Rationale of the *Sin-pyoo-Daw*, a bulky volume, including the observations of the most eminent students of the subject during a period of many years. Without committing ourselves to a definite opinion, we may devote most of our attention to the Siamese work, as embodying details not only regarding the white elephant, the undoubted lord of his genus, but also concerning a variety of other kinds, the existence of which is altogether unsuspected by most people. The greater part of both works is of course devoted to the white elephant and to the necessity of distinguishing between Xang Phuek, the genuine animal, and Xang Pratal, a "wonderful" but not otherwise so estimable elephant. It is reassuring to find that the test-points given by both works as to the determining of the white elephant agree in most particulars, for it is a notable fact that white elephants are not by any means really white. They are seldom better than a light-brown or dingy-cream colour, and are sometimes quite indubitably black. It is therefore desirable to know how impostors may be detected, and how homage is to be graduated, so that due respect may be paid to a worthy beast who does not fulfil all the requirements of the Xatthan, the celestial elephant, whose possession guarantees to its owner the universal sovereignty. It is agreed that the skin must have reddish colour about it, and that the eye shall be situated well forward on the head and adorned with a reddish outer annulus. This represents the circle of the nine precious gems and gives its owner a most sinister look to all but the connoisseur. Further, the teeth are of a particular formation, and it is absolutely necessary that the tail should be un mutilated. Evil-disposed sceptics, who endeavoured to injure a Xang Phuek's tail, would perish in the attempt. This seems very probable, irrespectively of superstitious beliefs. The toe-nails must also be pure black. To this the Burman observer adds that there must be five toe-nails on the hind-foot instead of the ordinary four. Any one of these signs will gain for its possessor great honour, for it is probable that in future existences he will develop the others and appear as the true animal. The final test in Burma, where the evidence is conflicting, is always that of water. This is solemnly poured over the candidate. If he turns red when wet, he is hailed as a veritable Saddan, and forthwith installed in all the honours and emoluments of his rank. But, if he is an impostor, his hide only becomes blacker than ever. This test seems to have been unknown to the learned author of the *Tamra Xang*. But, if he is silent on this point, he has a great deal to say about the multitudinous varieties of such elephants as are undoubtedly Xang Pratal, but do not rise to the excellence of the Xatthan. Of these there are ten superior kinds, including gold, silver, yellow, blue, green, and gray elephants. It will be conceded by all naturalists, as well as by the general public, that these animals fully merit the title of "wonderful elephants," and the only regret will be that they are so exceedingly rare. Our author confines himself to describing them, and gives no clue as to where they should be looked for; nor does he even refer to discovered specimens which might substantiate the belief in the species. As far as can be ascertained from his pages, these creatures figure principally in the stud of the Mahab Chakra-varitti Rajah, "the great wheel-turning king," the holy and universal sovereign, who appears once in a cycle, at the time when the waxing and waning term of mortal life has reached its maximum duration. This mighty ruler does not, as the vulgar suppose, ride always on the Xatthan, the celestial white elephant, but mounts these less distinguished animals, according to the direction in which he is travelling. He especially affects the golden and yellow varieties when he moves about at night, and the blue when he goes West. Wheel-turning kings do not, unhappily, appear during the dispensation of a Buddha; and, as there are two thousand years of the cycle of Gautama yet to come, the present generation stands but a poor chance of seeing golden elephants. Red and spotted elephants are, however, highly worthy beasts, and may be gazed on by the pious in the royal cities of most of the sovereigns of Indo-China.

Concerning the bad kinds of elephants we are instructed in some detail. This is natural and reasonable; for, though it would be a grievous misfortune for a man to neglect proper homage to a superior elephant when he met him, ignorance of the bad and vicious kinds might lead to immediate personal disaster; which it is desirable, even in an Eastern country, to avert from the king's lieges. Accordingly it is to be noted that elephants which affect a fish diet are of a particularly truculent and dangerous disposition. If they are caught by mistake, they must forthwith be let loose in the forest again, not merely for the captor's own sake, but for the general public good. The worst of them have special names. There is the Hinaxat, who wanders about the sea-coast and eats crabs. He will attack men at sight; and it is recorded that on one occasion a Hinaxat made an onslaught on a white elephant, an enormity before which the imagination pales. Worse even than this monster is the elephant Bek, who eats so much fish that he

has a scaly hide. This evidence of his iniquity is, however, a safe-guard, for the man who sees the scales will immediately recognize his peril. In this connexion it is well to remember that some evil-disposed person or imprudent experimentalist sent a keg of oysters to the Zoological Gardens for the consumption of Jumbo. It is not recorded that he ate them; but the danger to which he was exposed is much to be deprecated. He may not have had the appetite for fish originally; but the chance that it might have been developed was at least possible. No amount of admixture with bride-cake could then have saved him. He must have inevitably sunk into a Hinaxat, or possibly even a Bek. Let Barnum beware.

To receive honours, an elephant—whether white, golden, blue, grey, or red—must be a male. The female white elephant has yet to become a male before she reaches the last stage of complete perfection, the final step to pre-human existence. In proof of this, it is pointed out that, though certain female elephants have been much whiter to the vulgar eye than proved Xang Phuek, they have failed in some of the essential characteristics of the true animal. When water has been thrown on them they have not turned red, though they did not become black; their toes have been faulty, or their tails lamentably defective. Any one of these details is conclusive. It is necessary to be very careful, for the honours paid to the Royal White Elephant are extraordinary. The man who finds him, whether in Burma or Siam, receives forthwith a patent of nobility. A grant of land is made to him, extending on every side as far as one can hear the trumpeting of an elephant, and he is free from taxes and burdens of every kind for the rest of his life. The governor of the province where the animal is found receives orders from the capital to hew a smooth pathway through the forest to the nearest river where the white elephant can be shipped on board one of the royal barges. A body physician is sent to attend to him immediately, and an officer of state of high rank looks after the beast's worldly affairs, for the revenue of a district is set apart for the support of the Xang Phuek. When he arrives at the capital he is received in state at the palace gates. A richly gilded tribune is erected, on which the elephant is displayed for several days to the people, surrounded by constantly renewed bands of kneeling princes and priests. There are rejoicings all over the city; free puppet dances and shows of all kinds are exhibited in every quarter, and the general delight is extraordinary, for the discovery of a white elephant is a guarantee of the stability of the reign and a proof that the king's legitimate sovereignty is recognized by the unseen powers. Whenever the royal animal goes abroad he is covered with gold housings, and has a white baldachin or umbrella carried over him. Every day he is bathed with scented sandal-water, and his vessels and utensils are all of pure gold. Troupes of palace *coryphées* dance for his pleasure, and there are choruses of sweet-voiced singers to lull him to sleep. Gold and silver flowers, the sign of suzerainty, are presented to him, and the King of Men himself pays periodical visits to the King of Elephants. White apes and other white animals are domiciled in his palace to keep away "sick-devils," but it is sad to say that as a rule the white elephant is not healthy. His legs are usually swollen at the joints, and often covered with tumours; his sides are lean and hollow, and his dry hide furrowed with deep wrinkles. When he is ill the Sieng-ya, or "prophetic voice of the grass," is allowed to decide as to his diet. Herbs from all the different districts of the empire are laid before him for his selection, and if he favours one bundle more than another, fodder is regularly brought to him from that district, no matter how remote it may be.

Still, though the white elephant, and all elephants in Indo-China, are held in very high honour, they do not always occupy a very creditable place in the fables of the people. There is a long story in the *Non-thuk-pakkararam* about an elephant, Yukunson, who went mad, and rushed about the forest in mad fashion. He came upon a clump of bamboos, tore it down, and stamped to death the fledglings of a pair of hedge-sparrows, who had their nest there. The bereaved parents were in great tribulation, and fluttered about bewailing their wrongs. A crow who flew by was touched by their sorrow, and after giving them a deal of religious advice, such as grudging Westerns would believe him incapable of knowing anything about, he promised to see that right should be done. The three of them, therefore, went off and struck up an alliance with the frog, and then enlisted the fly on their side. This partnership did not seem very formidable, but the genius of the frog and the crow, both of whom in the story exhibit great wisdom and reasoning power, brought about a final triumph. The crow flew over Yukunson, the elephant, and pecked at his eyes. In the wounds the fly laid eggs. These bred maggots, and the elephant's eyes became terribly inflamed and he lost his sight. He wandered about the forest in torture, and wherever he went the hedge-sparrows flew chattering about his head, abusing him and exulting in his agony. To his other misery was added that of burning thirst. The frog seated himself on the edge of a deep abyss and croaked vigorously to make the elephant think there was water there. Yukunson followed the sound, and falling over the cliff was dashed to pieces. Nevertheless before he dies he moralizes on the wickedness into which even the most pious are led, and acknowledges the righteousness of the fate which has befallen him. His repentance is real, and saves him from the evil transincarnation which should have been the portion of so bad an action, but which would have been too great a punishment in the popular idea for so estimable a creature as the elephant. Here we are simply reminded that even elephants have bad passions;

but in another story the royal animal is distinctly made fun of. The cock and the elephant, we are told, once had a wager as to who could eat most. The contest created considerable interest in the animal world. Umpires, the cormorant and the squirrel, and a referee, naturally the crow, were appointed, and the elephant was installed favourite, at odds of six to one (offered). They commenced to a level start and the elephant made all the running at first. But the cock had more stay, and when the elephant had long since crammed himself to the throat with grass and leaves and twigs of trees, his opponent went on cheerfully scratching worms out of the earth and assimilating them in the most business-like way. This went on so long that it seemed likely that the elephant would develop a fresh appetite by dint of flapping his ears and swaying his body from side to side. At last, however, the cock turned his attention to the elephant's dung, and then his bulky antagonist fairly took to his heels, and ran off the field in a panic lest he himself should not be safe from the insatiable bird. It is a question whether it is fear or shame, but it is certain that ever since elephants have been unable to endure the rousing bird of dawn. The rooster always remains master of the situation. A knowledge of folk-lore is useful to travellers in this matter, for when they are on a journey, it is necessary to have the fowls carried in baskets by coolies. The elephant extends his aversion to hens, as being the possible producers of new cocks, and if an attempt is made to load him with the abhorred birds, he immediately takes fright, and becomes uncontrollable. It is curious that these two should be in such antagonism, for both of them were distinguished avatars of the Buddha, and it is to Buddhism that the elephant owes his great claim on the Eastern mind. But, though the elephant is thus on occasion made a butt of, he is not the less generally respected, and no Oriental would lower himself to the European platform, and avow his regard for the kingly beast on the simple ground of his being big and good-natured, and capable of eating an altogether extraordinary number of buns, though chanticleer did beat him in the match arranged for endurance.

A BOON TO INTENDING MURDERERS.

IT might perhaps be thought that the importance of maintaining capital punishment as a safeguard of society had recently been pretty clearly shown. The execution of murderers in Ireland has caused murder and outrage greatly to diminish, and fear of death has made men volunteer confessions throwing light on the Phoenix Park crime. Only the other day Mr. Trevelyan referred in the House of Commons to the effect which has been due to the terror inspired by the last penalty of the law. It seems, however, that the Government of which he is a member is of opinion that society has up to the present time been too hard on murderers, and that in every sense more law should be given them. It is not indeed proposed by the Home Secretary, the Attorney-General, and the Solicitor-General—who, with regard to the criminal law, represent the Government—to do away with capital punishment, because such a proposal might possibly cause some inconvenient clamour; but there can be very little doubt that the measure just brought in as a Bill to establish a Court of Appeal in Criminal Cases will practically abolish capital punishment, or at least will abolish it as against murderers of exceptional guilt. Under its beneficent operation, should it become law, the hangman's services may possibly be required now and then for a thoroughly commonplace criminal who commits a commonplace crime; but his operative hand will never be needed for the murderer who, in extinguishing life, shows any special cruelty or cunning. The dull ruffian who knocks his victim senseless with one blow, and knocks the life out of him with another, may possibly be hanged under the new law, though his chances of the gallows will be but remote. But by the Palmers, the Wainwrights, and the Lamsons of the future this instrument of justice will be regarded as something of no more import to them than the iron virgin of Nuremberg, or the uneasy bed of Ratisbon. Indeed it is doubtful whether some of the provisions of the Bill will not tend to ensure the liberty as well as the life of very bad criminals. In any case, it will certainly cause a striking change in the law. It is, however, only fair to say that it is less revolutionary than some of the Bills of the present Government. A due respect for property has been shown by its framers, as it offers considerable advantages to those who combine a taste for assassination with the possession of ample means.

The important enactment which thus gives a good chance to all murderers, and a specially good chance to some, begins with very simple and unobjectionable legislation, just as a Radical speech often begins with a little harmless commonplace. The first portion of Clause 3 gives the Court of Criminal Appeal power in capital cases to quash the indictment and proceedings when it appears that there was no jurisdiction in the Grand Jury to find the bill or in the Court to try it, and where the indictment combined with the verdict does not disclose any crime in point of law. To this no one can possibly object, but as, under the present law, a conviction can practically be quashed in such cases, this part of the Bill scarcely seems imperatively necessary. Any one unacquainted with criminal practice might gather from it that at present a man may be hanged when, according to the indictment and verdict, he has not committed any offence whatever; but the inference, though natural, would be wrong, as the

English Crown does not possess the power of executing subjects at will, which it certainly would have were the law such as is suggested by Section 1 of Clause 3 of the Bill. If, however, this practically introduces no change, and is therefore from a Radical point of view rather tame, that which follows it is certainly thorough enough to please anybody, as at one stroke it changes in most essential points the whole of the criminal law applying to capital cases. Under Section 2 the Court may set aside a capital conviction and order a new trial when it appears that the verdict was against the weight of evidence, or was not founded on sufficient evidence, or that evidence for "the defendant," as the Bill gently terms the convict, was wrongfully rejected, or evidence against him wrongfully admitted, or that there has been misdirection or a wrong conclusion on a point of law; or when, owing to some informality, or irregularity, or misconduct in the jury, "or from any cause whatsoever, there has been such a miscarriage of justice as to render it necessary in the interests of justice that a new trial should be had."

Wider powers could scarcely be granted, and it will be seen that the framers of the proposed statute have not been guided by the analogy of the civil law, as they have given the new tribunal even more extensive jurisdiction than is possessed by the Civil Courts. These can only set aside verdicts on certain specified grounds, not for "any cause whatsoever" that seems sufficient to them. At first sight it may no doubt appear to many that it is only fair that the Court should have these powers; but those who are conversant with practice, and take into consideration the peculiarities of some sections of the community, will probably think that the result of constituting a new tribunal with so sweeping a jurisdiction will be virtually to abolish or nearly abolish capital punishment. It may be said with truth that in England a murderer rarely wants friends, and least of all does he want friends when his crime is of a specially atrocious character. If, owing to its peculiar blackness, some act of homicide attracts general attention, there is usually a strong effort to obtain a commutation of the capital sentence. Good reason then exists for assuming that usually, or at all events in the case of all but very obscure miscreants, there will be an effort aided by humanitarians to obtain a new trial, and that, when there has been anything remarkable in the assassination, the effort will be a very vigorous one. The Court of Criminal Appeal will not improbably be more disposed to grant new trials than a Civil Court usually is. The judges dislike new trials on account of the great hardship to litigants, who are obliged to fight their battles twice over; but nevertheless, as every one knows, a fresh trial is very frequently granted. There will be no similar objection to granting one in a criminal case, and the judges will perhaps not be anxious to raise a violent outcry by refusing applications which will be resolutely pressed; and it may therefore fairly be assumed that, unless the members of the new tribunal take from the beginning a determined view of the nature of their functions, an application for a second trial will very often be successful.

Doubtless it may be urged that this will not lead to any bad results; as, if the accused is clearly guilty, he will be convicted on the second trial as he had been on the first, and will suffer the penalty which his crime deserves. Not a little may be said both for and against this view; but it is not necessary to discuss it, as it does not seem to have been taken by the amiable authors of the Bill. There is nothing definite in its provisions to prevent the Court from granting a third trial, or, for that matter, a fourth or a fifth. The second clause of the Bill says that "a defendant convicted on an indictment before a Court, in this Act referred to as a court of trial, on whom sentence of death has been pronounced" may appeal. No part of the Bill clearly and positively shows that this is merely intended to apply to the first trial. In Clause 9 the word "final" is used about decisions of the Court; but the context proves that this is merely meant to signify that, except where leave is granted, they shall not be open to review by a superior Court. It seems impossible to suppose that this omission was accidental; and it must be concluded therefore that the Act is intended to give the Appeal Court the power of granting a third or a fourth trial for "any cause whatsoever." No doubt judges will be chary of acceding to a renewed application; but judges cannot control popular feeling, and, when an application is refused, popular feeling will be strongly worked upon by the energetic people who constitute themselves the murderer's friends. Every one knows how illogical is the decision which is occasionally come to when some slight ground is shown, or thought to be shown, for doubting whether a convict committed the deed for which he has been sentenced to death. In not a few cases when this has happened the sentence has been commuted to one of penal servitude. By no reasoning can such a proceeding be justified, as, where there is no extenuating circumstance the accused should either receive the full penalty of his crime, or, if his guilt is not clear, be set free; but, inconsequent as this course may appear from a logical point of view, it has usually satisfied the popular instinct which was against carrying out the sentence of death. A similar popular feeling will prevent the execution of a man when it is thought that there are possibly some grounds for having him tried again. If the Government commute his sentence, this feeling will of course not be shocked; but if it is believed that they intend to let him be hanged, there will be a great outcry. It is hardly necessary to say which course a Government in our day is likely to adopt.

Very greatly then will the position of those who have indulged

a taste for homicide be bettered if this Bill, in which their interests are so fully considered, becomes law; and as, besides giving them the right of appealing indefinitely to the new Court, it gives them a possible appeal on law points from that Court to the House of Lords, it certainly makes a murderer's existence very fairly secure, much more so than that of an Irish official or a railway servant. It is true that for this appeal the permission of the Court will be necessary, but permission is not likely to be often refused, as judges will not care to bear the imputation of letting a man go to the gallows sooner than have their law corrected. On the whole, then, the Bill may be said almost to ensure the life of the assassin whose crime attracts attention, or who has command of money. An intense and natural aversion will always be felt in this country to executing a man who has been kept a long time in suspense; and, with such an Act as this, lawyers will be dull indeed if they do not succeed in keeping their interesting clients long enough in suspense to arouse sympathy and to cause the popular voice imperatively to demand a commutation of the sentence.

BOARDING OUT.

IN the Conference on the various methods of bringing up pauper children which was held last week in London a great deal was said about boarding out, and it is probable that efforts will shortly be made to extend the system to a much larger number of children than have hitherto been brought under it. There seems little doubt that where it has been tried under the supervision of efficient local Committees it has worked extremely well; and as the theoretical arguments in its favour are strong and obvious, successful experiment seems all that is wanted to make its adoption general. It has the merit in the eyes of Guardians who wish to do their duty by the ratepayers of being decidedly cheaper than the plan of collecting the children together in district schools; and it has the merit in the eyes of Guardians who wish to do their duty by the children of removing them from the pauperizing and demoralizing associations of the workhouse. A child who is brought up by a kindly foster-parent is soon lost in the general crowd of village children. It is ranked with the orphans who live with their grandmothers or their aunts. It thus begins life with no workhouse traditions or workhouse habits clinging to it. It goes out into the world just as any other child goes out, with a home which in a sense it can call its own, with a village life to which it can look back with no sense of disgrace, with the habits of humble industry which are learnt so easily in a cottage and with so much difficulty in a barrack. These are strong recommendations, and it is not wonderful that they should weigh greatly with conscientious Guardians and with a public which is growing justly uneasy at the faintness of the line which marks off poverty from pauperism.

It is well, therefore, seeing the force of the considerations which point to an extension of the boarding-out system, to recall the two important qualifications with which all accounts of its success must be taken. We have often drawn attention to them; but it is never safe to assume that this kind of work has been done once for all. Even outdoor relief, which has been condemned by every authority of any weight that has ever dealt with the Poor-law, has lately raised its head again; and, when there is so much to be said for a system as may be said with truth for boarding out, it is still more certain to present itself from time to time as the best, if not the only, solution of the problem how pauper children shall be educated. The first qualification which must be applied to all that is said in favour of boarding out is that it be done under the supervision of a good local Committee. It should never be forgotten that where a living is hard to earn, even the small sum which is weekly given for the keep of a pauper child may be an object of ambition. The sum, it is true, is calculated as closely as possible, so that it may not tempt any one who is not fond of children and anxious to have them about the house to take a child to board. But, however small the margin of profit may be, there must still be a margin. If the actual cost comes within a few pence of the estimate, it must still stop short of it. Every one who has had anything to do with the poor knows how much they will often do to add a very little to their weekly earnings. The choice really does not lie between adding this little in one way or another, but between adding it and not adding it; and when this is realized a very small profit may have very great attractions. When a child has been taken to board on a calculation that the sum paid for it will leave a certain trifling profit on the whole transaction, there is a constant temptation to make this profit a little greater. The motive for taking the child was the profit that can be honestly made by it; the motive for keeping it may be the profit that can be dishonestly made by it. If the Guardians pay 5s. 3d. a week, the odd 3d. may be enough in the first instance to attract foster-parents, but in the end the foster-parents may persuade themselves that there is a good deal to be saved out of the 5s. It is to guard against this deterioration on the part of the foster-parents' motives, as well as to make a good selection of foster-parents to begin with, that the local Committee exists. In theory it is composed of people who know the village thoroughly well, and, partly from knowledge and partly from inquiry and inspection, are able to determine which of the families that are

willing to receive a child to board with them can be best trusted to treat it properly. They visit the houses before the choice is made; they investigate the antecedents of the inmates; and when the children are sent there they take care that they are properly treated, and that they are really well and happy. So long as this Committee really does its work, there is little fear that boarding out will be abused. There are always some women in a village of whom it may be predicted with entire certainty that any child whom they take in hand will be kindly treated and well brought up; and others who, if they do not quite justify the same measure of confidence, are still well-disposed people on the whole, and only need a little watchfulness on the part of the Committee to keep them quite straight. But for the supply of both these types of foster-parents the Guardians must be dependent on the local Committee. It is the Committee who pick out the thoroughly good women; it is the Committee who keep the moderately good women up to their work.

It is this fact that suggests the first objection to any large extension of the system. Who is to ensure that the Committees are good at first starting, and who is to ensure that, if they are good at first starting, they will remain good? There are many people of all ages who like serving on Committees for quite other reasons than the usefulness of the work that has to be done. The social distinction implied in membership has charms for some; a genuine pleasure in activity of any kind is the motive with others. The first inducement is plainly one that cannot be relied on by a Board of Guardians. The desire to be on the same Committee with the great lady of the village will only in very rare cases carry the woman who feels it into a course of really useful work, when that work involves not merely punctual attendance at the meetings of the Committee, but punctual and intelligent attendance at the houses in which the children are placed. The second motive is undoubtedly better than the first, because the pleasure of doing work, when it is strongly felt, often generates a pleasure in doing work well. But the two do not always go together, and even when they do, they are often accompanied by disposition to take up more work than can be done properly, and, in choosing which shall be done, to give the preference to that last taken up. A Committee in which this element is largely represented may begin well, but it is not likely to go on well; a Committee in which the former element is largely represented is not likely even to begin well.

The second objection to the system is the old one that, if the position of a pauper child is made too pleasant, one great inducement to parents not to become paupers will be proportionately lessened. Of course this is not an argument that ought to be pushed very far. We have to consider the children as well as the parents; and, ordinarily speaking, the children will be the more important of the two. If they can be brought up free from the infection of pauperism, the next generation will have better chance than the present of seeing the inmates of the workhouses, and still more the out-pensioners of the workhouses, reduced in number. But the influence of boarding out on the parent must not be altogether lost sight of. If the condition of an orphan or deserted child is made in all respects as good as the condition of a child brought up by good parents in an independent home, the inducement to thrifless or ne'er-do-well parents to make no provision for their children during their lives, or, as occasion offers, to leave them to the charge of the parish, may become almost irresistible. The better feelings of such a parent will co-operate with their worse feelings in inducing them to take this course. They are forced perhaps to lead wandering lives, or, if not, to lead them has become a second nature with them. They know that this is bad for the children, that it prevents them from getting any continuous schooling, and is fatal to any habit of industry; and they will argue with great reason that their children will be far better off with a good foster-parent than they can ever hope to be with their natural parents. Whenever the custody of them involves any inconvenient cost or responsibility, they will thus be tempted to desert them, and, though desertion is a punishable offence, it is one the detection of which is exceedingly difficult. So long as the boarding-out system is only resorted to on a small scale, there is no fear of any such practice becoming general; but, if children supported by the community were known only to exchange a bad home for a good one, we might expect to see desertion grow to very large proportions.

UTILITARIAN THEORIES OF PERSECUTION.

THERE are many points of view, religious, moral, and social, from which the justice or expediency of persecution may be discussed, and that question has indeed more than once been treated in our own columns. It may be objected perhaps that such discussions are mere "gratuitous logic-chopping," inasmuch as in the present age there are none who desire to persecute, or could carry out their wishes if they did. But in the first place this is far from being obvious; there are persecutions and persecutions, and many people who have little love for the Salvation Army would say that a persecuting spirit worthy of Calvin, though exercised in a different cause from his, has recently been manifested at Geneva. And in the next place, supposing it to have no direct practical bearing, the ethical problem as such must always retain its interest. Most of our readers will be familiar with the elabo-

rate discussion of it in Mill's essay *On Liberty*, where he argues in effect that the collateral evils of persecution nearly if not quite always outweigh any possible benefit that can accrue from it, even on the theory of the persecutor. He begins indeed by insisting that we can never be certain that the opinion we are protecting is not false, and the opinion we are persecuting true, which of course is alone a conclusive argument, if once the premisses are admitted; but then a vast body of religionists in these, and still more in former ages, would deny the premisses. But he goes on to urge that heretical opinions are generally suppressed or neglected aspects of truth, and hence the persecuted belief, though not absolutely true, may contain a portion of the truth; and that is a view which will in some shape be admitted by the most orthodox of Roman Catholics; it is constantly, if we are not mistaken, utilized for his own argument by Cardinal Newman in his work on *Development* and elsewhere. In the third alternative, which he would consider a rare one, of the received doctrine being not only true but the whole truth, Mill still maintains that the belief of those who hold it will be strengthened and vivified by the freest discussion, and therefore would be really injured by suppression of the opposite error; they will gain a firmer grasp of their creed and a more intelligent apprehension of its meaning, and will learn to hold it, not as a dead dogma but a living truth. This last argument has sometimes been tortured or travestied into a defence of intolerance, and Dr. Johnson is cited for the assertion that the persecutors of Christianity were right—which, if they are judged from their own point of view, is an intelligible verdict—because persecution is an ordeal through which truth ought to pass and must always pass successfully, while it may often prove effective for the repression of dangerous error. The notion that truth always triumphs over persecution is dismissed, as we shall presently see, by Mill, as one of those pleasant falsehoods which have passed into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes; and in this Mr. Lecky agrees with him. But our immediate concern is with an ingenious paper contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* by Mr. Leslie Stephen on "The Suppression of Poisonous Opinions," consisting partly in an examination of Mill's argument, with some parts of which he disagrees, though arriving at much the same practical conclusion. He takes as his text a remark in Mr. Froude's *Life of Carlyle* that Cromwell regarded Romanism as "morally poisonous," and therefore from his "intense hatred of evil in its concrete form" refused to tolerate Romanism, where the context implies that, if we tolerate it now, that can only be, or ought only to be, because we no longer hold the same estimate of its real character. In other words, if we are sure that a belief is "morally poisonous," we ought not, Mr. Froude thinks, to tolerate it. On this thesis Mr. Leslie Stephen joins issue, not from the moral or religious but the "utilitarian" point of view, according to which whatever causes a balance of good is right; and the question before us therefore is simply one of fact, whether persecution ever does cause a balance of good; if it does, in that case it is right. Supposing for instance "the evil of the opinion is measured by the corruption of a whole social order, and the evil of the persecution by the death, say, of twelve apostles"—which is probably very much the problem that presented itself to the mind of an Emperor like Marcus Aurelius—"it is expedient, and therefore right to persecute," because it is right "that one man or a dozen should suffer for the good of the people."

Mill, who also reasoned on the utilitarian hypothesis, would not, his critic thinks, have denied this principle, but he denies its application, considering that the evils will always in fact outweigh any possible benefits of persecution. But he has hardly done justice to all the conditions of the problem. It is not very easy, e.g., to see why, on his showing, a "morally poisonous" belief, if such exist, should not be forcibly suppressed. Here Mr. Stephen comes in with an important consideration not noticed by Mill. However objectionable and false the opinion may be, a man who honestly holds it is not only justified in avowing but is bound to avow his belief, and therefore the persecutor must remember that by burning a man for his honesty he is inevitably exciting the disgust of all who care for honesty, however little they may sympathize with the errors honestly held by the victim at the stake. And "it must be in all cases a great, even if a necessary, evil that the law should outrage the conscience of its subjects." But is it necessary? "Sincerity," on utilitarian principles, "is a virtue because it is obviously useful to mankind," and therefore ought *per se* to be encouraged rather than discouraged by wise rulers. Assuming then, to take Mr. Froude's example, that Romanism is morally poisonous, is it better on the whole for the public interest to stamp it out by burning sincere Romanists than to allow the poison to spread? The persecuting argument rests again on the assumption that pain, or the fear of it, will stop a man's mouth; it cannot convert him, but it will hinder his converting others. Mr. Stephen admits thus much; he feels for himself that "there is no creed he would not avow or renounce rather than be burnt alive," though on the other hand, "happily for the race," there have been, and always will be, men of more heroic mould, like the early Christians, for instance, who prefer, as he puts it, immediate death to future damnation. But even waiving that consideration—which is an important one—we have not yet got to the root of the matter. When you have burnt your heretics, does it follow that you have eradicated the heresy? Before answering that question two fresh difficulties have to be encountered. "There is a difficulty in *catching the opinion* which is to be suppressed, and there is a difficulty about *arranging the machinery* through which the necessary force

is to be supplied." We may find that it is impossible to satisfy both or either of these conditions, except at a cost of evils which would more than counterbalance any attainable advantage. These are aspects of the problem which Mill has omitted to consider. He argues almost as if opinion was a "sort of definite object" existing in the mind like a germ of disease in the body, which can therefore be isolated and suppressed. But that will not hold good either of scientific or religious opinions. Take for instance, the Newtonian or the Darwinian theories, both of which have been denounced as dangerous to religion; and suppose it were resolved to suppress either by fire and faggot, and that the ruling powers had all requisite means at their disposal for the purpose, how far would such a policy be likely to succeed? The Darwinian doctrine may serve as an illustration but the argument applies equally to either:—

They object to the belief that men have grown out of monkeys. Would they, then, allow men to hold that the horse and ass have a common ancestor? or to question the permanency of genera and species of plants? Would they prohibit Mr. Darwin's investigations into the various breeds of pigeons, or object to his exposition of the way in which the multiplication of cats might be unfavourable to the fertilisation of clover? The principle shows itself in the most trifling cases; once established there, it spreads by inevitable contagion to others; the conclusion is obvious to all men, whether tacitly insinuated or openly drawn. To suppress it you must get rid of the primitive germ. When once it has begun to spread, no political nets or traps can catch so subtle an element. It would be as idle to attempt to guard against it, as to say that smallpox may rage as it pleases everywhere else, but you will keep it out of Pall Mall by a cordon of policemen to stop people with an actual eruption. The philosophy of a people is the central core of thought, which is affected by every change taking place on the remotest confines of the organism. It is sensitive to every change in every department of inquiry. Every new principle discovered anywhere has to find its place in the central truths; and unless you are prepared to superintend and therefore to stifle thought in general, you may as well let it alone altogether. Superintendence means stifling. That is not the less true, even if the doctrine suppressed be erroneous. Assuming that Darwinianism is wrong, or as far as you please from being absolutely true, yet its spread proves conclusively that it represents a necessary stage of progress. We may have to pass beyond it; but in any case we have to pass through it. It represents that attitude of mind and method of combining observations which is required under existing conditions. It may enable us to rise to a point from which we shall see its inadequacy.

You have in fact to choose between tolerating error, or what may prove to be such, and suppressing scientific inquiry, not to say intellectual activity altogether. And here Mill's argument comes in as to the advantage gained by truth from collision with the contradictory error, which probably corresponds to one aspect, though it be an illusory or incomplete aspect, of the truth.

But this estimate of the interdependence of ideas and the complexity of thought hardly agrees with the popular notion, which Mill endorses, that persecution, if only it is thorough enough, is sure to succeed. He tells us that "history teems with instances of truth put down by persecution," and proceeds to illustrate the statement from the various "Reformers before the Reformation," such as Arnold of Brescia, Savonarola, the Albigenses, the Vaudois, the Lollards, and the Hussites, and adds that in Spain, Italy, Flanders, and Austria Protestantism was rooted out, as it probably would have been in England had Queen Mary lived or Queen Elizabeth died. "Persecution," he adds, "has always succeeded save where the heretics have been too strong a party to be effectually persecuted. No reasonable person can doubt that Christianity might have been extirpated in the Roman Empire" had the persecution been sufficiently vigorous and persistent. Mr. Lecky, who quite agrees with him, cites the same examples. As an *argumentum ad hominem* one might perhaps ask how far in Mill's opinion either Christianity or Protestantism could be called "truth" in any but a very comparative and negative sense; but let that pass. To confine ourselves to the stock instance alleged of successful persecution, was the Reformation suppressed by this means on the continent of Europe? and even admitting that it was, have the most orthodox and rigid of Catholics any reason to rejoice at the ultimate result? We are disposed to agree with Mr. Stephen in answering both questions in the negative. It is the merest assumption that, if Italy and France and Spain had been free to choose, they would have become Protestant in the sixteenth century; and there is the fact to set against it, noticed in a famous essay of Macaulay's, that instead of spreading more rapidly Protestantism ceased to spread precisely when persecution began to be relaxed; "with all the liberty of conscience of modern Italy, the most enthusiastic Protestant scarcely expects its conversion before the millennium." Mr. Stephen thinks the sudden arrest of the Reformation which Macaulay emphasizes without undertaking to explain it, may be accounted for by the fact that "Protestantism, so far as it was a speculative movement, was not the name of a single principle or a coherent system of opinion, but of a mass of inconsistent theories approximating more or less consciously to pure deism or naturalism," and therefore "victories over Romanism were not really won by the creed of Calvin and Knox, but by the doctrines of Hobbes and Spinoza." At all events, be that as it may, the triumph of the Reformation in England and its failure in Italy and France seem due rather to "the complex conditions which predisposed one society to the Catholic and another to the Protestant doctrines" than to the action of their respective rulers. But, secondly, granting for argument's sake that Protestantism was suppressed on the Continent by persecution, the result was attained at a cost hugely disproportionate, of which the immediate suffering of the martyred heretics was a very small item, and at a cost

on which the persecutors have the least ground for congratulating themselves:—

In Spain, Protestantism was stamped out when it might have died a natural death, at the price of general intellectual atrophy. Had the persecutors known that the system from which persecution resulted was also a system under which their country would decline from the highest to the most insignificant position, their zeal might have been cooled. In France, again, if Protestantism was suppressed by the State, Catholics of to-day may reckon the cost. Thought, being (upon that hypothesis) forced into a different mode of expressing dissent, has not only brought about the triumph of unbelief, but the production of a type of infidelity not only speculatively hostile to Catholicism, but animated by a bitter hatred which even the most anti-Catholic of reasoners may regret. I am unable to decide the problem whether it is worth while to save a few souls at the moment with the result of ultimately driving a whole nation to perdition; but it is one which even those who rely upon the hell-fire argument may consider worth notice.

The general conclusion forced upon us is that persecution can only be successful, if at all, by strangling all intellectual advance and enforcing hypocrisy, while it produces "a dry-rot of the system defended" and accumulates a bitter crop of antipathies and undying ill-will between rival sections of society. Rome has not outlived in three centuries the bitter memories bequeathed by three years of Marian burnings. At most persecution can produce only a negative result, and perhaps in an age like ours, which has been described as "destitute of faith but terrified at scepticism," a policy which may serve to discourage unbelief but can never create or strengthen belief may be thought to have its attractions; that is the utmost that can be said for it.

We have only room to add a few words in conclusion on the last difficulty suggested by the essayist—viz. supposing a thorough-going persecution would answer your purpose, "how can you get persecution enough?" Bearing in mind what has already been said as to the complexity and interdependence of ideas scientific or religious, and the consequent difficulty of "catching" the heresy you want to suppress, we must remember how enormously this increases the difficulty of procuring any adequate machinery for its suppression. The heresy may disguise itself in a thousand varying and innocuous-looking forms of speech, and so remarkably has this ambiguity of language been exemplified in the case of the primary tenet of all religious belief, the being of God, that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that orthodox divines, mindful of the theistic professions of writers like Hume or Spinoza, have learnt to identify the term "deist" with "atheist." You will require then not only an omnipotent but an almost omniscient Inquisition to detect your heretic under all the Protean disguises which persecution will teach him to assume. A downright Tom Paine you may crush, but how will you restrain the wily latitudinarian who is equally ready to subscribe and elude any formula you propose to him? The most stringent and comprehensive code cannot execute itself; it must be worked by human instruments. And when you have invested your inquisitors of heretical gravity with such absolute and despotic powers as will subject the entire field of intellectual activity to their control—which is the primary condition of their even attempting to grapple with the gigantic task assigned to them—there remains the further difficulty of finding or training men both willing and qualified to undertake it. And if *per impossible* all these preliminary conditions were fulfilled, no plausible and external success could be achieved except by "limiting or asphyxiating" all intellectual progress. The mediæval Inquisition in a sense succeeded, though its influence has been largely overrated, because it was substantially in harmony, not in antagonism, with the spirit of the age, and was thus rather a symbol than a support of orthodox belief. What possibilities of success, assuming such success to be desirable, would remain to an Inquisition which was called into existence, not to represent and uphold the dominant temper of the age, but to suppress it?

MARINE INSURANCE.

TO a great maritime country like our own the progress of marine insurance is necessarily a matter of interest. Our very existence as a great Power depends upon our pre-eminence at sea. If we were to lose that even for a short time, we should not only be unable to defend our colonies and possessions beyond the ocean, but we should be absolutely at the mercy of other countries for our food. We do not raise at home even half the food we require, and if our naval supremacy were lost, we should be unable to import this food in case of a war. But our naval pre-eminence rests upon the magnitude and excellence of our mercantile marine, and that in turn depends upon the prosperity of the carrying trade. We do the greatest carrying trade the world has ever seen. Our shipping carries by far the largest proportion of our own trade, and it carries also considerable proportion of the trade of other countries. Now marine insurance depends upon the prosperity of this trade. Insurance Companies, it is true, have capitals and reserves; but these in reality constitute only a guarantee. The business of insurance, whether of ships, of other property, or of lives, is based upon the principle that the premiums received shall not only cover all risks and defray all expenses, but leave in addition a fair profit; and it is evident that this cannot be done unless the business in which our shipping is engaged is itself profitable, and our ships are well handled and well built. It is conceivable that marine insurance might be unprofitable, even though the shipping trade itself were prosperous, because of

mismanagement or over-competition; although it is difficult to believe that the unprofitableness could continue for a long time. But it is evident that, if marine insurance is profitable, shipping business must be good. No amount of care as regards risks insured, no amount of skill and good management, could make insurance profitable if the loss of ships continued year after year to be excessive. In that case the premiums received would not cover the risks and expenses and leave a profit. Therefore, if we find that insurance is fairly profitable, we may safely assume that our shipping trade is conducted upon sound principles. The growth of our mercantile marine, no doubt, is *prima facie* evidence of the prosperity of that trade, but it is not in itself conclusive. Indeed, there are some who argue that the very magnitude of the growth testifies to the contrary. They allege that we need a large addition to our mercantile marine every year, because the losses are enormous. There are others who argue on other grounds that the losses are enormous. We all remember the allegations on which Mr. Plimsoll's agitation was based. And although the general verdict was that those allegations were exaggerated, they contained sufficient truth to compel Parliament to legislate for the protection of sailors' lives. It is to be feared that past legislation has not been sufficient, since facts are coming to light which seem to prove that further measures are required. The *Weekly Official Intelligence* of last week contains an analysis of the account of marine Insurance Companies made up to the 31st of December, which enables us to form some conclusion as to the profitableness of our shipping trade. The *Weekly Intelligence* is published under the authority of the Committee of the Stock Exchange, and the analysis, therefore, may be regarded as official. It includes the accounts of twenty-three Companies, but unfortunately some of them do a life and fire as well as a marine business, and it is impossible to distinguish quite accurately between the marine and the other classes of business. Still for the object we have in view the analysis is sufficient. It ought further to be added that, although the accounts are brought down to the end of December, the years dealt with are really not the same, some of the Companies making up their accounts to the end of December, some to the end of June, and some to the end of other months. If our object were to compare the Companies one with another, or to compare the working of last year with previous years, this would be a material point, but, as it is not, the matter is of no real importance.

The twenty-three Companies have a paid-up capital of somewhat under four millions sterling, with reserve funds of about two and a quarter millions. Thus what we called above the guarantee fund of the Companies is between six and six and a quarter millions—a very considerable sum no doubt, showing that the Companies, irrespective altogether of the capital still to be called up, are in a solvent and strong position. The risks incurred amounted to the enormous sum of nearly 210 millions, of which 173 millions had run off or had been reinsured at the end of the year, leaving 37 millions of risks still hanging over the Companies, or, roughly, about one-sixth of the amount for which the offices became liable in the course of the year. Unfortunately the analysis does not tell us what proportion had run off and what proportion had been reinsured. If the 173 millions had all run off in the course of the year, the difference between marine and life assurance would be very strikingly illustrated. Except where the primary object is to borrow money, and the insurance effected is really only a collateral security given, the person who insures his life intends that the insurance shall continue as long as he lives, though circumstances may disable him from continuing to pay the premiums subsequently. But the shipowner usually insures his ship and the merchant insures his cargo only for the voyage or for a definite period of time. Consequently, as we see, a considerable proportion of the insurances had come to an end when the year terminated. But another considerable and indefinite proportion has been reinsured; and here we come to a difficulty. It is usual with a Company, when it takes a large risk, to distribute this risk by reinsuring with other Companies. It is probable therefore that, when we are told that 173 millions had run off or been reinsured, these reinsurances had been largely effected among the very Companies here dealt with. In other words, the liabilities remained when we take the twenty-three Companies together, for if one of them freed itself from the risk, it did so, to some extent at any rate, by passing it on to others of the twenty-three Companies. No doubt, reinsurance may have been effected at Lloyd's or with foreign Companies, or with other Companies not included in this list; but it is probable that to some extent at least they were effected with some of these Companies. It does not follow then, when we are told that 173 millions had run off or been reinsured, that the twenty-three Companies taken together were relieved of about five-sixths of their liabilities, as at first sight would seem to be the case. The net premiums received during the year amounted to 2,370,000*l.*, a surprisingly small sum when we note the enormous magnitude of the sums insured; and especially small if, as we have suggested, the reinsurances were to some extent mutually effected among the Companies we are dealing with. It amounted, in fact, to only about 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* per cent. The balance at credit of profit and loss at the end of the year was 1,161,000*l.*—a very handsome sum, considering the smallness of the paid-up capital of the Companies. And after distribution of dividends 380,000*l.* were carried forward to the current year, to cover any liabilities from the past year not yet liquidated, to help to equalize dividends in the future, and to swell the reserve fund. But five Companies appear to have paid no dividends in the past half-year,

though some of the Companies included in the list were started so late as 1881; and several of the dividends were very large. One dividend is as much as 36 per cent.; another, 35 per cent.; two are at the rate of 20 per cent.; two at the rate of 15; and there are several at rates ranging between 5 and 10 per cent. It will be seen, then, that the Companies did a very profitable business, although the past half-year was exceptionally unfavourable in consequence of the gales which caused such an unusual number of shipwrecks towards the close of the year.

The Insurance Companies which do marine business are of later date than Lloyd's. At Lloyd's, as our readers probably are aware, each underwriter acts for himself, or in a private partnership; and Lloyd's was in active operation for many years before any joint-stock Company was formed to carry on marine business. We are, of course, unable to say whether Lloyd's do as profitable a business as the Insurance Companies, and many persons assert that, in fact, the underwriters at Lloyd's do not; that just as the private banks are dying out under the competition of the joint-stock banks, the underwriters at Lloyd's are losing business by the competition of the joint-stock Companies. Moreover, it is obvious that a private firm, however rich the partners may be, cannot do the large business of a great joint-stock Company. The private firm must necessarily limit the risks it takes, and in consequence the premiums it receives are so small that it can probably not invest any large proportion of these, and so receive a handsome interest upon the money. The joint-stock Company, on the contrary, is able to invest the money. For example, a Company may insure a ship that is trading to the far East, and even if the ship meets with an accident the demand for payment may not come upon the Company for a full year afterwards. In the meantime the Company has the use of the premium paid, which it lends out at a handsome interest upon the Stock Exchange or invests in first-class bonds. It is thus receiving a good interest upon the premium before the claim has to be met. There are few underwriters, however, who can venture upon such risks as would give them premiums of thousands of pounds, and who therefore can receive a large income from interest in this way. It is probable therefore that the Insurance Companies are really doing a more profitable business than the underwriters at Lloyd's. But, if we exclude the receipts from loans and investments, it is believed that the actual insurance business done by the underwriters at Lloyd's continues very good and fairly profitable. There is much grumbling indeed against the competition, not only of the joint-stock Companies, but of the foreign Companies who are doing business in this country. But at the same time it is said that the business done by Lloyd's is as large as the underwriters can do, and that the number of underwriters is constantly growing. We believe that the number at present exceeds 250.

REVIEWS.

STEPHEN'S HISTORY OF THE CRIMINAL LAW.*

THE History of the Criminal Law of England has not only fallen into good hands; it has fallen into the hands of the only man who could have written it so that it should be not a mere dull record of statutes and decisions, but a work making the past alive—work comprehensive, luminous, and interesting. Of all its qualities, the most conspicuous in Mr. Justice Stephen's work is its very great interest for very various classes of readers. To say that it is as entertaining as a novel is nothing. It is as entertaining as a good Blue Book, the most entertaining form of literature, except scandalous biographies, with which our generation is provided. It is a history of the English criminal law, and a very good history, well told, well proportioned, lively, yet discreet and dignified. But it is also very much more. It is full of piquant dissertations on matters of current interest. It gives free play to the enunciation of original and characteristic opinions, and to the kind of criticism which startles and enlightens, but does not wound. In *A History of the Criminal Law of England* we find a sketch of the criminal law of Rome, an elaborate comparison of the merits of the English and French systems of criminal procedure, a subtle disquisition on insanity, and a collection of typical English and French trials. There is, therefore, an ample variety in the contents, and although it is impossible that every part of the work should be equally interesting, there are very few parts that have not a special interest of their own. In its arrangement, the work is divided into two sections of nearly equal length, the first treating of the machinery by which criminal justice is administered, and the second treating of the history of the law administered. In other words, the work treats first of courts, and then of crimes. The more ancient part of the history of courts, including that of procedure, is perhaps that which it must have been the most laborious to compose; but the chief duty of the writer was to arrange materials which the labours of previous inquirers had amply provided. Mr. Justice Stephen has, however, added some curious illustrations from comparatively modern records of the survival of early customs and traditions in special localities. He offers, for example, two curious illustrations of the working of trial by jury in its early and

* *A History of the Criminal Law of England.* By Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, K.C.S.I., D.C.L., a Judge of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division. London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

rude form. The first is from a tract called "Halifax and its Gibbet Law." He gives an account of a trial in 1650 for theft under the customary criminal law of the locality. The bailiff of Halifax directs four jurors to be brought from the respective townships of his district in charge of their own constables. The jurors are directed to get at the facts. They question the prisoners, elicit confessions as far as they can, and adjourn when necessary to make inquiries on their own account. They find the facts and also pronounce on them, and the bailiff merely registers their sentence. The second illustration is from an institution still in vigour. There is in the space between Temple Bay and Catherine Street a district known as the Liberty of the Savoy, which has a court, with a steward, eight burgesses, and a jury of sixteen appointed for the year. When the jury meets, any inhabitant of the district who has such a grievance as that his neighbour's house is unsafe or disorderly informs the jury, who inquire into the matter as they please, and if they are satisfied that punishment ought to be inflicted, they themselves inflict a fine. As Mr. Justice Stephen remarks, such an institution throws great light on the manner in which trial by jury originated. It is an institution fit for a small precinct, where every one knows every one, and can watch and form an opinion upon what goes on. These illustrations also, it may be added, throw great light on the mode in which the book has been written. They serve perhaps the humble aim of amusing the reader, but they chiefly testify to the joy with which the writer finds new life in a subject with the abundant interest of which he is completely penetrated.

From the early part of the sixteenth century there is something like a record of the method in which criminal trials were conducted. The history of what are called State Trials is to be learnt more or less adequately from the collection familiar under that name. This long history Mr. Justice Stephen surveys from the point of view, not only of a learned inquirer, but of a very free critic. He takes trial after trial, and himself tries the judges, the juries, the witnesses, and the prisoners. None of his conclusions will perhaps so much startle the ordinary reader as his very adverse observations on the history of juries. After jurors had ceased to be witnesses, and had come to be mere listeners to evidence adduced under the guidance of a judge, with the duty of saying whether a crime had been established to their satisfaction, they had a burden thrown on them which they were exceedingly unfitted to bear. Gradually they got better able to bear it; but that was because the society to which they belonged had improved. The best that can be said for them is that they were not corrupt; the worst, that they reflected only too faithfully the political passions, the superstitions, and the cowardice of the day. It is not trial by jury that has made English liberty, but the progress of English liberty that has made English juries progressively decent. Criminal trials became infinitely better in their method and results. The judges were more humane and enlightened, the juries had a little more conscience, the rules of evidence were better understood; the prisoner, although involved in a new network of statutory crime, had some little chance of escape. But this was because English society had improved. The administration of the criminal law was immensely improved on two occasions—after the triumph of the Revolutionary party in the Civil War, and after the Revolution of 1688. During the ten years which preceded the Restoration and from the date of the Revolution of 1688 the administration of the criminal law was practically what it is now. But it has been good simply because the party which wished it to be good according to our ideas was triumphant. That party had got hold of the physical force of the country; the just treatment of criminals was, as Mr. Justice Stephen substantially puts it, a luxury in which the Government, being strong enough, was able to indulge. This is the key to all his criticisms of the trials of three centuries, and it is a criticism which is at least instructive even if it dispels some illusions. A weak or a threatened Government cannot afford to be very squeamish about its criminal trials. The Governments of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth were not weak, but they were perpetually threatened; the Governments of Charles I. and Charles II. were threatened, and tried in a convulsive way to be strong. The one great merit of English criminal law after the beginning of the sixteenth century was that it did not allow torture. It did not allow this because it rejected what seems the merciful rule of the civil law, that there must be two witnesses. In practice this merciful rule came to mean that when there was one witness he might be believed, but then the accused must be tortured until by his confession he had added a second testimony. Torture apart, the Government managed criminal trials pretty much as it pleased, and, being in danger, procured convictions. The main question, therefore, which Mr. Justice Stephen invites his readers to consider when examining the Tudor trials is, whether the Government rightly considered itself in danger. It is quite out of place, according to this view, to introduce modern ideas, to ask whether the judges were independent, juries honest, evidence carefully sifted. Independent judges, honest juries, carefully sifted evidence are the products of a strong, firmly established, enlightened, and free society. It is not wonderful, therefore, that Mr. Justice Stephen should take a very different view, for example, of such a trial as that of More from that taken by Lord Campbell, who applied his liberal modern ideas to everything in the past, and of whom Mr. Justice Stephen gives himself the passing pleasure of saying:—"This delightful writer and most powerful and impressive of judges seems to me to be in his biographies as impressive by topics of prejudice as a common juryman." To the mind of

Mr. Justice Stephen no form of depreciation could be more incisive.

By degrees, by very slow degrees, a system of criminal law and a system of criminal procedure have been built up in England which, as compared with what may be found in any other country, Mr. Justice Stephen thinks very good indeed. The time is now come when, he is of opinion, both may be codified with advantage. If it is possible now to codify them, he more than any other man will have made it possible. But no one could be more anxious to have the work well done if it is to be done at all, to have it done slowly and to have it done as a whole. If any separate part is done, he is anxious that it shall not come into operation until the whole receives the sanction of Parliament. The country, as he most candidly explains, can very well wait for a criminal code. Those who administer the criminal law know perfectly well what is the law they have to administer, and criminal trials are already as fair as they can be. Possibly it might help an innocent man if, when accused, he was allowed to give evidence; but, even if this is so, it cannot need a code to give him a facility which is now denied him. The great advantage of codification is, in the eyes of Mr. Justice Stephen, that it will carry with it a great moral lesson to the public. It will come on the people as a legislative exposition of the duty of man to his neighbour as laid down in the Church Catechism. Mr. Justice Stephen has so thoroughly considered everything bearing directly or indirectly on the criminal law that any opinion he expresses must command the greatest possible weight. But it is not obvious why this should be the effect of a code. A code is of use to bad people, as, if they very attentively study it, they can see how near they may go to breaking the law; and of all unprofessional students of codes there are none so persistent and acute as students of this class. To some very few good people the code is of use as it informs them that acts are criminal which in their hasty ignorance they thought perfectly permissible. The vast majority of the nation is just where it was, with a general feeling in favour of the law, with a hearty indignation against some few crimes, and with a well-deserved confidence in judges and juries. Mr. Justice Stephen is most earnest in his desire that the popular indignation against crime should be in every way fortified. He is never tired of describing habitual criminals as the enemies of society whom it is at once legitimate and desirable to extirpate; and some of his practical suggestions, such as that all persons guilty of ravishing or attempts to ravish should be well dogged in addition to the other punishment they receive, are in the highest degree acceptable. But it is difficult to see how the embodiment of criminal law in a code should make any great difference in the popular feeling towards crime, and have any of the moral effect of a legalized Catechism.

Mr. Justice Stephen in the course of his history and his discussions supplies us with abundant material for understanding what is the nature of the popular feeling towards crime, and what are its limits. He rebukes, and justly rebukes, the maudlin humanitarianism which can scarcely endure the thought that evildoers should reap what they have sown. But that modern society should regard crime in some new aspects is inevitable. For example, the author tells us, with the frank common sense that distinguishes him, that our ancestors used to hang more people than we do, not because they hated crime more, but because they had no convenient place where to put the criminals except the grave. They had not an elaborate system of penal colonies, penitentiaries, model prisons, and reformatories. We have got these appliances, and can examine at our leisure whether it will not be better to use them in any given case than the gallows. Society again feels itself much stronger, and cannot affect to be in awe of that free criticism of the Government which was a real danger when the Government was weak. But when we speak not of modern society generally, but of England specially, there seem to be inherent limits to the indignation felt against crime merely because it is described as crime in a book. There are crimes which, although crimes, are on the borderland of things which are not crimes; and in the English system it is a mere chance whether such crimes are punished or not. We leave it to the person who happens to be aggrieved to decide whether he sets the law in motion or not. It is entirely impossible that there should be any strong popular indignation about such crimes, whether they are described as crimes in a Code or in an Act of Parliament. Since he published his work Mr. Justice Stephen may have possibly cast his eye on a case that came before Mr. Justice Chitty. A Company was in liquidation, and counsel advised that there were grounds for proceeding criminally against some of the directors. Mr. Justice Chitty looked into the matter, and agreed that the directors had laid themselves open to a criminal charge. Was he, a judge, the embodiment of the majesty of the law, fired with any indignation against crime? Not in the least. He took the sensible English view, and said that he would consult the principal creditors and see whether they would like to spend the money of the estate in putting bad people in prison. Punishment of crime was a luxury, and the judge asked people who had lost money whether they would care to indulge in it. Indignation against crime must have its bounds in a country where such a way of putting things is considered not only proper, but part of the duty of really prudent and considerate judge. Then, again, the very free way in which Acts of Parliament are criticized, and by no persons more freely or more justly than by judges, necessarily lowers the tone of popular feeling regarding all statutory enactments. Mr. Justice Stephen pours out the vials of his wrath on an Act lately passed

for aiding the publishers of newspapers in proceedings for libel. He does not see why this class of persons should be especially favoured, and he strongly deprecates the innovation of proving justification at a preliminary stage. It is unnecessary to enter upon his arguments against the Act, but it is obvious that even in a judge a profound reverence for the law generally is quite consistent with the free expression of an opinion that a particular part of the law is extremely silly. Lastly, there is in England a large body of criminal law which is existing law, but which is not enforced, which no one ever thinks of enforcing, and which is not repealed, only because it is treated as a dead letter. Mr. Justice Stephen gives a history of this body of law which is very curious and very entertaining, and few readers can peruse this history without the fearful joy of discovering that they have unconsciously committed a crime over and over again. This body of law is very judiciously to be left out of the Code; but the catechismal effect of the Code must be somewhat impaired by the knowledge that outside the Code there is a long catalogue of offences created by the same authority and sanctioned by similar punishments, which every one is at liberty to commit, and which many persons habitually commit with perfect impunity.

Of the historical portions of the work the most exhaustive and masterly is perhaps that giving the history of the law relating to seditious libels. Of the dissertations the most novel and important are perhaps those discussing the relations of English law and international law in criminal cases, and the nature of insanity so far as it can be regarded as an excuse for crime. Mr. Justice Stephen analyses every account of a prosecution for seditious libel in the eighteenth century which is recorded in the State Trials, and he gradually leads the reader to three opinions with which it is safe to say few readers would start. The first is that the judges gradually built up a very sensible and humane law regarding seditious libels. The second is that the judges, in doing this, spoke as the organs of a society gradually growing strong, humane, and sensible. The third is that juries had nothing to do with the building up of this law, except as affording a medium of publicity. When Erskine expressed that devotion to trial by jury which he embodied in his motto he really meant trial affording an opportunity of public declamation. He declaimed, society listened, society acted on the judges, and the judges made the law. In the dissertation on International Law Mr. Justice Stephen notices at length the case of the *Franconia* and the controversy as to the duties of commanders of British ships of war when fugitive slaves come on board. Every one is agreed that international law consists of the agreements and customs of nations regulating their dealings with each other. To this body of law, if it is to be called law, additions are made from time to time. If these additions are made by custom there must be a beginning of the custom. In order that the new custom may be binding on an English Court there must be at least acquiescence after notice by the English Government. The best, perhaps the only valid, way to establish a new custom is to do some act to start the custom, and then see if other nations acquiesce in it. This the English Parliament did when it passed the Territorial Waters Act. It started a custom, although it adopted the decorous pretence that a custom already existed which a majority of the English judges had just pronounced did not exist. Nothing could better illustrate the true value of the unauthorized opinions of text-writers on international law—a hazy set of people, for whom Mr. Justice Stephen expresses a supreme contempt. They might have received more indulgence from him if he could have brought himself to regard them as writing, not for judges, but for diplomats. They lead up to the establishment of new customs by supplying diplomats with a justification for doing or protesting against the act by which some State introduces a custom. From courtesy the State that takes the initiative wishes to affect to be doing as little as possible, and, like the English Parliament, has the gentle grace to say, on the authority of the text-writers, that the new custom is nothing new. In this way international law is always growing. New opinion leads to new customs signalized by some notorious act, and then the act is antedated and made to run from the expression of the opinion, so that the custom seems to have no precise beginning. Into the vexed and difficult question of insanity as an excuse for crime Mr. Justice Stephen enters as no judicial writer ever entered before. He inquires what is meant by mind, what by intention and motive. He asks medical writers what they mean by insanity, and grieves over the insufficient answers he finds in medical writers of the highest repute. He shows how very complex is the term "know" in the phrase applied to a criminal that he knows his act to be wrong; and he concludes that the legal meaning of the term is, or ought to be, that the criminal is in a state to compare his contemplated act with the general standard of the opinion of society regarding such acts, and then, while seeing that this standard condemns him, still does the act. He may have lost the power of making this comparison; if he has lost it entirely, he ought to undergo the ordinary treatment of an insane person; if he has lost it partially, he ought to be treated as insane, but harshly treated. It is impossible to notice, except at great length, the reasons on which the writer bases conclusions which will delight many medical men and startle many lawyers. In the next great case where insanity is set up as a defence we shall probably hear much of this part of Mr. Justice Stephen's work. To the ordinary reader it is the most difficult, but certainly not the least interesting, portion of a work which is delightful and instructive from one end to the other.

WILFRED'S WIDOW.*

MR. PAYN, or some other moralist, has remarked on the inconvenience of having an idiot for one's solicitor. *Wilfred's Widow* may be regarded as an illustration of the disasters which befall when an idiot solicitor has an idiot client, who, again, possesses a family whose innocence verges on the idiotic. The idiot client is a Mr. Wilfred Lomax. His innocent family consists of his daughter Ally, a sweet girl of eighteen; his sister-in-law, Aunt Lyddy Temple; his son Wilfred (absent in Australia); his niece Constance (in love with Wilfred), and his son Geoffrey, absent somewhere with his regiment. Into the happy and harmless family circle of the Lomaxes falls, like dynamite, the following letter from the idiot solicitor. We are obliged to quote the whole document, by way of proving how thoroughly imbecile a solicitor can be in a novel. Please observe that the letter is undated—"without place or date," as the epistles of an idiot attorney ought to be:

MY DEAR MISS TEMPLE,

I am very sorry to be obliged to write a letter that will give you great pain, but I believe it is better to address it to you than to Wilfred Lomax. Mr. Hazlewood's father wrote to make inquiries about his son from me lately, which lead me to conclude that it is about a year since he had heard direct from him. In fact, I believe he started two years ago from Sidney on a gold-digging expedition, and that the letters that have been received from him since were naturally few and irregular.

I do not know whether this silence will in any way have prepared you for the sad news I have to communicate, for I regret to say that I have by to-day's post received the melancholy intelligence of his death. His effects, I am informed, have been forwarded, and will arrive by the next vessel. It appears that he died of fever, at A—. A friend nursed him to the last, who, unfortunately, caught the fever and died shortly afterwards; but by him your nephew was well cared for. I fear a robbery was subsequently committed by the wild people among whom they were; but he leaves none behind him in need of the gold for which he risked and lost his life, though I believe that it was not for the gold his life fell a sacrifice, but rather for the adventures that the search brought with it. A letter from his uncle, Mr. George Lomax, written shortly before he started for A—, hinted that a love-affair had something to do with his joining the expedition. Further particulars will doubtless arrive with the effects sent home. His uncle's death occurred very unfortunately, as but for that he would probably have returned sooner, or, at all events, more about his last days might have been known.

With every possible expression of regret and sympathy under this great affliction,

Believe me, my dear Miss Temple,

Yours very truly,

JOHN CLITHERO.

We have read this astonishing communication again and again and have failed to detect in it one glimmer of reason. It appears, as far as anything appears, that Mr. Hazlewood's father is anxious about his son; that his son has died at the gold-diggings, and that a friend of the son's has also (as Wilfred's Widow says later) "kicked the bucket," after nursing young Hazlewood. On hearing this news Ally, Wilfred's sister, exclaims, "It is Wilfred they are writing about," and Constance says, "A friend nursed him and died for him." What concern the Lomax family has with the death of young Hazlewood, or of his anonymous friend, it entirely puzzles us to explain. The sentence about "his uncle's death" is even more perplexing. Any client but Mr. Lomax *père* would have written a somewhat irritable letter to John Clithero, but the idiot client fell, helpless as an involuntary bailee, into the trap set by the idiot solicitor. All the Lomaxes, and their young friend Sir Percival Ross (in love with Ally), bewailed Wilfred as people without hope, and, as far as we have observed, made no attempt worth speaking of to unravel the Hazlewood-Lomax mystery and to discover the truth about Wilfred's death.

A family like the Lomaxes is the natural prey of adventurers and adventuresses. Nothing therefore could be less surprising to the average novel-reader than the sudden arrival of a letter in which it is announced that Wilfred is married, and another from the idiot solicitor saying that Wilfred's widow will soon present herself to her sorrowing relatives. Old Mr. Lomax is literally staggered by these announcements, which Constance (in love with Wilfred) receives like an angel, and which do not so utterly surprise Ally. Wilfred had confided to Ally in strict secrecy his love for a beautiful being, tall, and graceful as a lily, with a profusion of beautiful hair. This interesting creature had of course no difficulty in persuading the idiot solicitor that she was the real widow, and that no other was genuine.

Wilfred's widow soon appeared, and charmed every one by her extraordinary loveliness. In the course of conversation she incidentally remarked that she had brought her child with her. The Lomaxes had heard of no child, but, as the lyric dramatist sings,

The interesting fact remains,

He was a little boy.

A little boy he was, but still he was a bigger and more precocious boy than might have been expected from the very short period of Wilfred Lomax's union with his bride, now Wilfred's widow. Indeed the whole circumstances of the birth of this child verged on the prodigious, and he might well be called *l'enfant de miracle*. A letter reaches England from Australia in about six weeks. Add six weeks more for a letter from an upland station, and allow for one or two mails being delayed, and we get, at the outside, half a year between Wilfred's marriage and the date of its being announced to his family. In about four weeks more, as far as we

* *Wilfred's Widow*. By the Author of "Mrs. Jerningham's Journal." London: Bentley & Son. 1883.

can make out (for Constance, who fell ill on the arrival of the first letter, was scarcely convalescent when the second came), the idiot solicitor announced the arrival of Wilfred's widow in town. The child she brought to the Lomaxes looked "two and a half years old," on the evidence of Aunt Lyddy, and only two years or so had passed since Wilfred first let Ally know that he was in love, promising to tell her more "when everything was smooth." It will thus be perceived that Wilfred's child was no mere yearling, though even that would have been nearly as remarkable as the birth of Strephon in *Iolanthe*, when his mother was "minus eight" years old. But these circumstances aroused no suspicion in the breasts of the innocent Lomaxes. Wilfred's widow and the "prodigio son" were warmly welcomed.

The widow now began to put the singular innocence of the Lomaxes to the most curious proofs. First, she knew nothing about any of them, about their relations to each other, or about their social position. She knows nothing about "Aunt Lyddy," does not know that Constance is Ally's sister, has never heard of Geoffrey, and so forth. Now all this is doubly absurd. In the first place, even the Lomaxes might have become suspicious of so much ignorance (unless they thought all the world as idiotic as their attorney), and, in the second place, Wilfred's widow, though not his widow, had been his betrothed. "I loved her once, but we could not be married," Wilfred explains at the end of the novel. Now Wilfred came of an exuberantly affectionate family. While he was Silvia's lover (Silvia was the name of "Wilfred's widow"), he was quite certain to have told her all about his fond sister, his pretty cousin, his dear aunt, his soldier brother.

Wilfred's widow steadily persevered in showing her hand, and in trying to open the eyes of the Lomaxes. She talked slang; she was recognized by a Mr. Vaux who had seen her alone at a theatre—in fact, as it appears, at the Lyceum, while Mr. Irving was acting Hamlet. She obliges the unsuspecting and honest Ally to aid her in an intrigue by which she drives from the neighbourhood a gentleman who knew all about her. She calls Aunt Lyddy "an old fool." She makes love to Sir Percival Ross (in love with Ally), and lures that guileless baronet into the most cruel scrapes. She detects him in the act of planting lilies of the valley for Ally early in the morning, and she leads him away into secluded walks. When old Mr. Lomax makes her an allowance, she says, "I don't see how it's possible to cut up hand-somer." All this the Lomaxes attribute to a colonial education. "Ally found herself wishing very much" (like an extreme Radical) "that England had no colonies." Finally, Wilfred's widow can stand the dulness of the country no longer. She runs up to town "to see a dentist." She buys a light blue set of apparel in Regent Street; she meets Sir Percival, kisses him, makes him give her a dinner, takes him to the opera, comes back to her hotel to make, as she says, "a night of it" with Percival, and there meets Ally and Aunt Lyddy. She assures them that Wilfred made her promise always to wear blue and hear music on the anniversary of their wedding-day. As for Percival, he argues in favour of Silvia's "making a night of it." "Some girls are very sensitive; they can't be always miserable, they'd go mad. They have to throw it all off for a bit, and then that gives them pluck to go at it again." This is ingenious and original, but not convincing. Finally Silvia traps Sir Percival, or tries to trap him, into an offer of marriage. But, as the reader has anticipated, the genuine Wilfred comes home, like Wilfrid Ivanhoe, and explains all the business. He had been in love with Silvia, but found she had a husband still living. Another girl, Silvia's cousin, threw herself on his protection, and he was foolish enough to marry her, though the whole affair was a transparent trick. This wife of his had died, and the sham widow had simply clad herself *dans le peau d'une autre*, had assumed the legal status of the dead woman. After this revelation "Wilfred's widow" fled the scene, taking with her the child, about whom she did not care a farthing. The quaint thing is that among all her intrigues Silvia is supposed to remain devotedly attached to Wilfred, her sometime lover, and his memory.

This analysis may perhaps prove that the author of *Mrs. Jerningham's Journal* is either sadly unskilled in the conduct of a plot or is wonderfully careless in managing her narrative. Her style has plenty of gaiety; her description of the griefs of Constance and Ally is natural, if not naturalistic; the command of slang she shows in the conversation of Silvia deserves commendation. Sir Percival Ross is very slightly sketched; a good deal of difficulty is avoided by keeping Wilfred out of sight till the end. The moral of the author seems to be that pretty woman, however coarse in mind and speech, can beguile and deceive all men and most women. We certainly credit her own sex at least with greater penetration. The novel "permits itself to be read," for it is short and lively, and never lags; but the plot is a miracle of carelessness of construction.

SUNNY LANDS AND SEAS.*

WE are quite ready to give the author credit for one position taken up in the preface and maintained throughout the book. He may have had neither "theories to support nor prejudices to overcome." And, like many other travellers, he has

* *Sunny Lands and Seas; a Voyage in the S.S. Ceylon: Notes made during a Five Months' Tour in India, the Straits Settlements, Manila, China, Japan, the Sandwich Islands, and California*. By Hugh Wilkinson, of Lincoln's Inn. With Illustrations. London: John Murray. 1883.

detected inaccuracies in the accounts of his predecessors, and has been disappointed on first landing at celebrated ports. Dr. Arnold in opening his inaugural lecture on Modern History observed that "when a stranger enters St. Peter's for the first time, the immediate impression is one of disappointment; the building looks smaller than he expected to find." And Arnold goes on to say that a closer acquaintance convinces us that our first impression arose not from want of greatness in what we saw, but from a want of comprehensiveness in ourselves to grasp it. There was nothing, it seems, for Mr. Wilkinson to do or see at Calcutta, and when he had "done" India, the Straits Settlements, and Japan, he discovered that he had been terribly misled by Miss Bird in her glowing description of the Sandwich Islands. Now it is impossible to lay down any precise canon as to the amount of experience which justifies a traveller in printing and publishing his notes. It is not every one who could write like Mr. Seebom about so remote and melancholy a region as Siberia. Some authors, on the other hand, like Mr. Gallenga for instance, after a tour of three months in which they got no further from England than Bombay or Central India, could turn out a narrative graphic, original, sparkling, and full of interest in the eyes of old residents. Mr. Wilkinson spent six months in going round the world, but he has added little to what we knew already. There are certain general rules in such cases on the observance of which readers and critics have a right to insist. A writer should beware of hasty generalization. He should distrust first impressions, especially when his time is so short that they are likely to be his last. He should abstain rigidly from all silly jokes, slang expressions, and exaggerated anecdotes. What are we to think of an author who facetiously turns the name of his companion, Mr. Wood, into De Bosco, informs us in a note that by "tin gonies" he means "gin tonics," and holds that a supply of that truly delicious fruit, the mangosteen, would "do people more spiritual good than all the ministers of every known religion in the world are able to do"?

As there was nothing very extraordinary in the author's mode of travelling, so there is nothing very striking or original in his remarks. There is now and then some infantine simplicity in his admissions. For instance, he ate a mango on arriving at Bombay, and found that, instead of being one of the finest fruits of the earth, it had an unpleasant flavour of turpentine and musk. Any Griff could have told him that mangoes vary in quality and flavour as much as English pears. Mr. Wilkinson appears to have gone to the native bazaar and to have swallowed the first specimen offered him. From Bombay the author went by Baroda, Ahmedabad, and Jaipore to Delhi, and at this last place we have the old stories of the explosion of the Cashmere Gate by Lieutenants Home and Salkeld, and of Hodson shooting the King's sons, varied by remarks on the Kutub Minar and the Chandni Chouk. We are also informed that the Indian atmosphere is strangely different from our own, and that marble monuments in the East are not disfigured by filth and "greasy soot." At Agra he was distressed at the sight of a young girl who was being drenched with water and forced to inhale smoke. From the description we should hazard a guess that the poor girl was being treated for fever or else was exorcised; but this painful incident was soon forgotten in the real pleasure of seeing a young Hindu wife playing with and coaxing her baby "just in the same way as our mothers do at home." That Hindus have strong family affections seems to have astonished him; but a lad actually behaved very unlike a crossing-sweeper or an English Arab, for he made deep salaams on receiving a few coppers, with a ceremony and humility quite overpowering. On the journey from Lucknow and Benares to Calcutta the bewildering discovery was made that natives, even little children, would not take food from the hands of an Englishman, although they would take money eagerly. The disappointment experienced at the sight of Calcutta we take to be simply the result of inability to comprehend the exact importance of that great commercial metropolis and seat of government. He finds fault with the noise and bustle and offensive smells; and we are tempted to ask whether recent reports about expensive drainage, a supply of pure water, and methodical conservancy are pure myths. As a barrister, he was naturally interested in the enormous fees given to his professional brethren, whether practising in the High Court or deputed on special retainers to local tribunals in the interior; and he swallowed with avidity a vague story of a barrister somewhere in the Mofussil carrying away in a cart the sacks of r-pees with which he was paid. A native gentleman—pleader or barrister, we are not told which—asked him to his house, told him stories about the tyranny of caste and the social position of widows, and entertained him with the sight of a burning ghaut. The name of this gentleman is given as Mr. Kishori, which is pretty much as if a foreigner were to say of a visit to our own Bar that he had been asked to dinner by Sir Henry or Sir Farer. We hazard a guess that the full name indicative of the *gens* may have been Kishori Chand, and either Bose, Ghose, or Mitra, the leading houses of the Kayast caste. But, if Mr. Wilkinson had only remembered the child's story of "Eyes and no Eyes," he might have spent his mornings profitably at the Indian Museum, the Town Hall, the Metcalfe Hall, and the Asiatic Society; and his afternoons in driving round Alipore, Garden Reach, and Ballygunge. A visit to Barrackpore and its beautiful park, or even the Salt Water Lake or the English cemetery, might have saved him from fretting for four or five days and wishing himself in the Himalayas. The most elementary treatise on

Anglo-Indian history, or an ordinary guide-book such as Mr. Eastwick's, enables most educated men to lay up a store of pleasant experiences from a week's stay on the banks of the Hooghly and in one of the finest months of the cold season.

To say the truth, Mr. Wilkinson strikes us as being much happier at sea than on shore. To sit in a cabin with the ports open, to wander dreamily on the deck, to smoke on the forecastle, to watch the flying fish and the shoals of porpoises, to bathe in tepid salt water at sunrise, and to play a rubber of whist after dark, have more charms for some natures than the solid triumphs of English statesmanship or the splendid legacies of Hindu and Mohammedan art. The butter on board the *Ceylon* was rather a trial, for it reminded him of melted train-oil; but at Manilla he had a "most enjoyable jolly time." Canton, for smells, was nearly as bad as Calcutta. We were rather apprehensive, at the mention of opium, of a deliverance on the merits of this political problem; but fortunately Mr. Wilkinson was persuaded to try a pipe, and, finding the taste not absolutely unpleasant, he omitted to record his opinion about the rights and wrongs of the traffic. Japan produced more pleasing impressions than Canton or Hongkong; and we do Mr. Wilkinson the justice to say that he has given a good description of the Inland Sea traversed between Nagasaki and Kobé. In one place the channel was twenty miles broad; in another it was as narrow, apparently, as the Straits of Bonifacio or the Kyles of Bute. The shores were beautifully wooded, and the background was composed of mountains 5,000 or 6,000 ft. in height. Those who have seen any specimens of Japanese art can easily credit all that is said in praise of their variety, finish, and splendour. The bronzes, paintings of trees and birds, lacquer-work, and specimens of furniture polished and inlaid, equal or surpass most articles of Hindu manufacture, or may claim precedence, as being much more uncommon. We cannot say that we are much interested in learning that four Japanese damsels at a rest-house or roadside inn "polished off our grub"; but we note the curious fact that letters posted in Japan within a week of each other arrived in England on the same day by Brindisi and by America. The latter, owing doubtless to the rapidity with which everything is managed in the United States, beat the former in actual transit by one week. We question whether it was necessary to swell this journal by an epitome of Mr. Mitford's account of the ceremony of Harakiri; nor is the author very well advised in challenging a comparison between his own style and that of another more practised writer. Between Japan and Honolulu, a distance of 3,500 miles, a gale was experienced which did infinite discredit to the Pacific though it fully tested the qualities of the *Ceylon* as a sea-boat; but nothing but disappointment and disgust were excited by the Sandwich Islands. There were too many churches, chapels, and schools. The streets were straight, and the town was laid out in squares, and the rich vegetation was coated with dust. Mr. Wilkinson would have shown better taste if he had omitted all remarks about missionaries and their attempts to educate and convert the natives. Clergymen sent out to reclaim heathens are occasionally injudicious and make too little allowance for prejudices and feelings. But it is quite impossible that a sojourn of eight days, several of which were occupied with the trip to the volcano of Kilaeua, could give even such rapid observers and practised writers as Sir George Campbell and Sir Richard Temple the right to dispose summarily of the effect of missionary preaching on the lives and the number of the people. It is very likely that in Cook's time the population numbered 400,000, and that it has now dwindled to less than 50,000. But this identical process is going on everywhere in other colonies—Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. And we are not aware that missionaries or chaplains have been called to account for the process of diminution. The tourist's snare is to pick up random information at a table-d'hôte and to retail it as if distilled from Blue Books, aided by close personal observation. At Kilaeua the travellers saw the furnaces actively at work. One of them suddenly became larger; the glowing surface cracked like ice in a thaw; fountains shot up in the air; the molten lava swirled; and the level of the fiery lake dropped four or five feet. The heat was terrific when the wind shifted; and we should say that these visits are not unattended with serious risk. The only mishap that befell the party on this occasion was that two of them missed their way on the return to Hilo Bay, and were in reality making off to the interior instead of to the shore. Beyond delaying the departure of the steamer they did no harm to themselves or any one else. Yet a similar mishap might happen to excursionists in the Scotch Highlands or on the glaciers of Switzerland, and no one would dream of putting it into a book.

The trip included, further, San Francisco and the Yosemite Valley. A bill of fare for breakfast at the former place is rather a curiosity for abundance and variety, and the account of the celebrated trees, and the rocks, whether known as the Half Dome, or the Cathedral Spires, or the Three Brothers, is less disfigured by slang and facetiousness than the other chapters. We are thankful to be spared a description of Niagara, and are quite ready to believe that its "stupendous magnificence is beyond all words." Mr. Wilkinson says, towards the conclusion of his narrative, that he was only moved by four different sights or scenes—the vegetation of the Tropics, the Taj Mahal, Kilaeua, and Canton. There is some discrimination in the selection of the first three; but we do not make out that Canton is more worthy of especial notice than the Hindu city of Benares.

or than Cairo before it lost its distinctive Oriental character, or than Damascus, which is perhaps the oldest city in the world. Canton is, no doubt, more Chinese than Hongkong or Shanghai; but, after all, its wonders seem to have consisted of narrow streets, fish markets, eating-houses displaying a quantity of native delicacies—such as pigs, rats, and snakes—and the execution-ground still besmeared with the blood of decapitated criminals. A table of distances shows that Mr. Wilkinson traversed 28,000 miles, of which about one-fourth, roughly speaking, was on dry land. His trip may have benefited his health, and his letters may have given some pleasure to a large circle of friends; but we may ask if there was not one man amongst them judicious enough to beg the tourist to refrain from rushing into print?

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ST. ANSELM.*

ST. ANSELM is the most universally attractive figure in the history of mediæval Christendom. Eadmer, the loving disciple and biographer to whom we owe most of our knowledge concerning him, has shown how Anselm strove throughout his life to be all things to all men, in the best sense of that much-abused saying of St. Paul's. Many other noble men amongst his contemporaries, and especially amongst the scholars of Clugny and Bec, made the same attempt, and not without success. They served their own generation in one way or another, but are now forgotten or are only occasionally remembered; whereas that which distinguishes St. Anselm above all his contemporaries is that he still retains, and must permanently retain, a hold upon the respect and attention of all sorts and conditions of men. This is the result of the unique manysidedness of his character and work. The devout hagiologist who accepts without doubt all the miracles attributed to Anselm by Eadmer, and the sceptical leader of the critical school of Tübingen who analyses the theological system of Anselm in his three volumes on the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, find a common meeting-point and common object of reverence in the extraordinary man who united in himself a rare sanctity and an epoch-making intellectual force. His life, as told by Eadmer in the *Historia Novorum* and in the shorter *Vita Anselmi*, and supplemented by the hundreds of letters written by Anselm as monk, abbot, and archbishop, possesses all the elements of a fascinating story. We do not wonder that any one who has studied these rich materials should be tempted, like Mr. Rule, to begin the compilation of a new biography of the saint, though we do wonder that any one who has read Dean Church's rendering of the subject should have the hardihood to believe that he can produce something better. Dean Church's *St. Anselm* is one of the masterpieces of modern English biographical art. It is nearly perfect in conception and in construction; it is detailed, without being prosy or over-elaborated; it is sympathetic, but not slavish and gushing, as Mr. Rule's book is; it is critical, which Mr. Rule's book certainly is not, though he occasionally revises Dean Church, Dean Hook, and Mr. Freeman; it does equal justice to the masculine intellectual force and to the almost feminine tenderness of its rare hero; its historical setting is put together with the skill, exactness, and grasp of a born historian; its accessories are sufficient to elucidate the subject without being so diffuse as to divert the attention from it; its chief fault is that it is too short. But we do not envy the artist who fancies that he can paint a better portrait than a master has done by simply painting a bigger one. Mr. Rule seems to imply, if we correctly understand one of his contrasts between his own work and Dr. Church's, that the Dean of St. Paul's has done little more than "reproduce without stint what Eadmer has said about St. Anselm in his two works," though he adds that the Dean of St. Paul's has compiled this *précis* from the English monk with "a grace, a skill, and an appreciation of our hero's character." We naturally wish to discover the improvements in conception and in contents by which Mr. Rule imagines his portrait to be distinguished above Dean Church's. He does not compare it with Dean Hook's, with Hasse's, or with Rémyat's. Dean Hook's portrait of St. Anselm is perhaps the most conspicuous failure in his gallery of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and it is faulty because it has been worked out under a similar inspiration to that which has moved Mr. Rule. Dean Hook and Mr. Rule agree in giving a very glaring confessional *Tendenzfarbe* to their pictures. They differ only by using the most opposite colours. The late Dean of Chichester was quite capable of admiring Anselm's unique goodness and intellectual greatness; but, as a fervid Anglican, he was indignant with the Saint for supporting the internationalist Pope against the national claims of the Church and King of England. He saw in Anselm a wrong-headed ecclesiastical politician who confounded the Hildebrandine party with the Catholic Church. Mr. Freeman has lately told us that Dean Hook "came to know Anselm better before he died." Anselm seems to be chiefly attractive to Mr. Rule for precisely the opposite reason. It was, of course, utterly impossible for an Archbishop of Canterbury in the end of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth to take such an attitude toward the See of Rome as could be taken by Cranmer in the sixteenth century and by Laud in the seventeenth. But, if it had been possible, if there had been such an archbishop, and if he had been the holiest of saints and the most subtle of thinkers, he would have had no attraction for Mr. Rule. The fault in the conception of Mr. Rule's biography is consequently a repetition of Dean

Hook's fault. His two bulky volumes, like the portion devoted to Anselm in Dr. Hook's second volume, considered as literature, fall to the level of a *Tendenzschrift*. No competent critic would dream of applying such a title to Dean Church's *St. Anselm*, notwithstanding the covert insinuation in Mr. Rule's apologetic preface to his own work. So far as concerns the elaboration of Mr. Rule's biography, we cannot but admire the zeal, research, and patient labour which he has bestowed upon it. He appears to have visited all the spots connected with the life of the Saint in Burgundy, in Normandy, and in England. There is one local touch in Mr. Rule's account of St. Anselm's consecration of the parish church of Harrow-on-the-Hill which is sufficient to reveal to the expert the strict carefulness of his details.

The unusual manysidedness of Anselm's character and work justifies the claims to a share in him which are put forward by the most widely differing parties; each of the claimants has some right to call St. Anselm a pioneer upon his own particular road. As a theologian, as "the second Augustine," he holds so important a place in the evolution of the doctrine of the Atonement that almost every theological professor in a German university or an American denominational college seems to be compelled to include in his course a summary or a criticism of Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*. The intensely monastic abbot of Bec, the Primate of Britain who asserted the privileges of the Roman Church and its Bishop against two Kings of England, has not unfrequently been appropriated by modern Protestants as an Evangelical of the Evangelicals. One of his latest German biographers, Professor J. L. Jacobi, of Halle, has observed in the new edition of Herzog's *Realencyklopädie* that "whenever Anselm has to impart consolation to the dying, he rises to the pure elevation of the Evangelical faith. On all such occasions he neglects the intercession of Mary and other Saints, which at other times he by no means despised, and points solely to the satisfaction of Christ for all sins." The late Mr. Maurice, and the late Dean Stanley after him, claimed Anselm as the pioneer in some sort of a broad and liberal theology, on the ground of his daring and remarkable solution of the doubts of his predecessor Lanfranc as to the right of the English Archbishop to the title of Saint and Martyr, which had been conferred upon him solely by the canonizing voice of the English Church and people. On the ground of his bold assertion of the Hildebrandine theory of the right relations of the Church and the State against William Rufus and Henry I., it is only natural that he should be claimed by Roman Catholic biographers as a pioneer of modern Vaticanism. His unique place in the history of philosophy as one of the few originally productive thinkers of mediæval Europe, as "the father of scholasticism," is recognized at the present day in the philosophical faculty of every European and American university. His struggle for political and social righteousness in England, his determined attempt at a moral reformation of the whole people and clergy of our nation—a subject which is but thinly illustrated in Mr. Rule's work—must always give to the later years of this remarkable man a fresh and lively interest for the modern English politician, historian, and student of social evolution. St. Anselm, like his English-born suffragan the aged St. Wulstan, as we learn from one of the canons of his great National Synod of Westminster in 1102, might even have been claimed by Wilberforce and Clarkson, by Lloyd Garrison and the American Abolitionists, as an early pioneer upon their road. Mr. Rule, notwithstanding the diffuseness of his volume, can only spare nine or ten lines to the record of this Council. That true Englishman, Thomas Fuller, recognized its importance to the English nation, and he has given a free translation of all its canons. Eadmer tells us that Anselm reckoned so much upon it that he begged the King, Henry I., that the English "primates regni," as well as the English bishops and abbots, might be present *huc conventi*. Bishop Hefele curiously observes in his introduction to the canons that "this practice of holding a reunion of the bishops for every session of Parliament was continued in England until the end of the eighteenth century." St. Anselm had told Pope Paschal II., in the end of William II.'s reign, that he had seen in England "multa mala, quorum ad me pertinebat correctio, quae nec corrige, nec sine peccato meo tolerare poterat." We may conceive that he held the slave-trade to be one of these *mala*; and he plainly regarded a national synod as the right means for their correction. It was one of his great complaints against William that he had stifled the synodical life of the Church of England. He wrote to Paschal, "Concilium non permitit celebrari in regno suo ex quo rex factus jam per tredecim annos." Mr. Rule has no sense of proportion. He is so possessed and carried away by his interest in the conflict between the King of England and the Pope during the primacy of Anselm that he hurriedly passes over, as a matter of small moment, the one event of that primacy which was of the very nearest concern to the English Church as a whole, about which Anselm himself was supremely earnest, which affected all the parochial clergy and mass of the Christian people in England. Dean Church, in spite of the smallness of scale of his picture compared with Mr. Rule's, devotes more space to it. Such an omission, or at least such a slur, which is as bad as an omission, is inexcusable in a "Life and Times" of St. Anselm for the telling of which the teller uses nearly a thousand pages. The convocation of a general council of the English bishops was probably disliked by William Rufus, as Mr. Freeman has suggested, for the same reason for which it was so eagerly desired by the Primate—because "the synod was a real instrument for the reformation of manners."

We not only disagree with Mr. Rule's conception of his subject and with his ill-proportioned distribution of its matter, but we find his manner singularly unpleasant. Sometimes he confounds

* *The Life and Times of St. Anselm.* By Martin Rule, M.A. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co. 1883.

the duty of the biographer with the art of the historical novelist. He is fond of painting "scenes." He takes a passage from Eadmer, and by aid of a large fund of far-fetched allusions and conjectures expands it into a picturesque "scene." He makes large demands upon the willingness of his readers to accept his conjectures wherever there is a dearth of facts. Thus he thinks it "very probable" that Anselm's parents remained for a long time without a second child, which enables him to drag in illustrations of saints and monks each of whom was a *unicus filius*. He has "little doubt" that the rough Gundulf regarded his child as the future Bishop of Aosta, which is made the occasion of a page and a half of stories about Guibert of Nogent's father and St. Odo's father. As William of Dijon's mother "had a vision of 'the heavenly queen and troops of angels'" before her son's birth, Mr. Rule has "no doubt" that Ermenberga, prior to the birth of Anselm, "hoped for the consolation of a vision touching the destiny of her child." Eadmer tells us that when the young Anselm was passing from youth to manhood, strong in body, and favoured with secular prosperity, his earlier aspirations toward the monastic life began to cool, and that study was put aside for manly games. His love to his mother kept him within bounds; but, adds his disciple and biographer, "Defuncta vero illa, illico navis cordis ejus quasi anchora perdita in fluctus saeculi pene tota dilapsa est." Upon the thin evidence of these words, some of his biographers have concluded that Anselm plunged into immorality. Mr. Rule is indignant at the charge "against a blameless adolescence," and he interprets Eadmer's words in the *Vita Anselmi*—he does not refer to Anselm's own words—by one of the most characteristic of his incessant conjectures. "His utmost extravagance of conduct may have been that he once provided himself a pair of hawking gauntlets; but even so it is more than likely that ere he could go forth and whistle the falcon to his wrist, his mother, whose prayers had long attended him in the austere and religious seclusion of his study, saw them and persuaded him not to put them on." If Mr. Rule were writing a novel with Anselm as its hero, such conjectures would perhaps be tolerable, but in a biography they are intolerable. In his anxiety to say something touching and picturesque, he forgets that Eadmer has told us that Anselm's mother was dead when her son came to the worst. Mr. Rule expends three pages upon "a theoretical reconstruction" of the new Basilica at Bec. "Alas for us," he exclaims, "that it should have perished! Alas, too, that the name of its architect should not have been preserved, nor any account of him!" He fills up the lack of certain evidence as to the building with a conjecture that "it marked an epoch in the history of ecclesiastical architecture in Normandy," and the want of evidence as to the architect with a guess "that he was a master builder from Pavie and a relation of Lanfranc." The interjections of regret are quite in Mr. Rule's manner. While his biography in some aspects is a sort of historical novel, in other aspects it is like a funeral sermon preached by a friend of the deceased. It is too continuously gushing, hysterical, pathetic, sentimental, and tearful. The good characters which appear in its pages seem to be in a chronic state of weeping. We find the word "tears" on page after page; and in some of Mr. Rule's "scenes" at Bec, which he always calls "La Bec," we see Abbot Herlwin, Lanfranc, Anselm—all manly men—in tears; at one time he shows us all the monks in tears. Perhaps the most amusing of all Mr. Rule's conjectural scenes is his long description of Lanfranc and Anselm crossing the Seine at Rouen in a ferry-boat. He cannot help introducing tears into this wholly fanciful vignette. "Lanfranc," he tells us, "gazes on Anselm with brimming eyes." Some one seems to have suggested to him, while he was revising his proofs, that there was a bridge across the Seine at Rouen in 1060; for Mr. Rule naïvely adds in a foot-note:—"I frankly own that I cannot find an authority for the suggestion that there was no bridge across the Seine at Rouen in the spring of 1060. I have no proof either way. So, *quod scripsi, scripsi.*"

The most conspicuous flaw, however, in Mr. Rule's biography is his total omission of any attempt to fix the place of Anselm amongst the really original thinkers of Western Christendom. He has plenty to say about his Prayers and Meditations; he often makes a pleasant and chatty use of his valuable Epistles; but he only touches in the most casual way upon the splendid intellectual works of Anselm. It is characteristic of the difference between Anselm's English and German biographers that the former should treat him almost exclusively as a man of action—as monk, abbot, prelate, and statesman—while the latter deal with him chiefly as a theologian and philosopher. This is not only the case with the Protestant Hasse, but the Roman Catholic Schwane, in his article on St. Anselm in Cardinal Hergenröther's new edition of the Freiburg *Kirchenlexikon*, only just published, devotes seven columns to the dogmatic and speculative work of the great "Vater der Scholastik," and only four columns to his outward life as monk, prelate, and statesman.

MYSTICAL VERSE.*

DR. HAKE is one of the most earnest and original of poets. He has taken nothing from his contemporaries, but has imagined a message for himself, and has chosen to deliver it in

* *The Serpent Play: a Divine Pastoral.* By Thomas Gordon Hake. London: Chatto & Windus.

Pearls of the Faith. By Edwin Arnold. London: Trübner & Co.

terms that are wholly his own. What that message is and what those terms are is easily said, and is worth the saying. For Dr. Hake the accidents and trivialities of individualism, the transitory and changing facts that make up the external aspect of an age or a character, can hardly be said to exist. He concerns himself with absolutes alone, with the eternal elements of human life and the immutable courses of human destiny. It is of these that the stuff of his message is compacted; it is from these that its essence is distilled. His talk is not of Arthur and Guinevere, nor Chastelard and Atalanta, nor Paracelsus and Luria and Abt Vogler; of "the drawing-room and the deanery" he has nothing to say; nothing of the tendencies of Strauss and Renan, nothing of the New Renaissance, nothing of Botticelli, or the ballet, or the text of Shakespeare, or the joys of the book-hunter, or the quaintness of Queen Anne, or "the true Chippendale feeling," or the morals of Helen of Troy. To these he prefers the mystery of death, the meaning of life, the quality of love human and divine; the hopes and fears and the joys and sorrows that are the perdurable stuff of existence, the inexhaustible and unchangeable principles of activity in man. That this is so is a reason why his work should be always interesting, as it is also a reason why it should be always more or less unpopular. It is only to the few that, reduced to their simplest expression, the "eternal verities" are engaging and impressive. To touch the many, they must be conveyed in human terms; they must be presented not as impersonal abstractions, not as matter for the higher intelligence and the higher emotions only, but as living, breathing, individual facts, vivid with the circumstance of terrene life, quick with the thoughts and ambitions of the hour, full charged with familiar and neighbourly associations. This with Dr. Hake is by no means a necessity. He loves to symbolize; he does not always care that the symbol shall be appropriate and plain. He prefers to work in allegory and emblem; but he does not always see that, however representative to himself, his emblems and his allegories may not be altogether representative to the world at large. His imagination is at once quaint and far-reaching—at once peculiar and ambitious; and while it never produces what is contemptible, it is often guilty of what is recondite and remote. In his best work—in *Old Souls*, for instance, and *Old Morality*—the quaintness is merely decorative; the essentials are sound and human enough to be of general and lasting interest, and to have a capacity of universal application. Elsewhere he is scarcely so felicitous. His imagery is apt to become strange and unaffected, his fancy to work in curious and desolate ways, his message to sound abstruse and impertinent. Such effects, too, are deepened by the qualities and the merits of his style. It is peculiarly his own, but it is not always fortunate. There are times when it has the true epic touch—or at least as much of it as is possible in an age of detail and elaboration; there are times when it has a touch of the pathetic—when in homeliness of phrase and triviality of rhythm it is hardly to be surpassed; and there are times, as in "The Snake Charmer," when, as in certain passages in the work of Wagner, it is so studiously laboured and so heavily charged with ornament and colour as to be almost pedantic in infelicity, almost repellent in complexity of unnecessary suggestiveness. If we add that in an epoch which has been trained upon the passionate and subtle cadences of the Laureate, and the large-moulded, ample, irresistible melodies of Mr. Swinburne, Dr. Hake chooses to deal in rhythms of the utmost naïveté, and in metrical forms that are simplicity itself, we shall have said enough in general terms. We may pass on to particulars and to the consideration of *The Serpent Play*, the poet's latest, and, in some respects, his most important, contribution to literature.

The theme of it is the eternal contest between good and evil, between Psyche and Kausis, the spirit of Nature and the spirit of Decay, the victorious and immortal soul and the changing and irresistible world. The scene is among the Ophidian Hills. The hero is Coalis, the soul-seeker. He renounces the world, he casts out everything that is vile, he stakes his all on the life eternal; and to this, in what seems the hour of defeat, when all the passions of the heart have broken loose, and when Kausis, the Serpent, has achieved a universal triumph, he actually attains. He has sought out the Psyche indefatigably, though he has seen that there is no proof that her promises are true; he has put earthly love away from him, and yearned for and believed in the facts of love divine, and in the end he is rewarded:—

What senses now from earthly senses surge!
His soul creates; from him all things emerge.
He thinks of Psyche; her encircling streams
Of pointing light strike to the shaded skies.
He thinks of his Volupsa; the same beams
Pass through her as he gazes in her eyes,
Which steeped in human love before him shine,
Their sympathy the speech of intercouse divine.
The heavens are measureless, the dead are free;
With their brief day on earth their sorrows cease.
O Grave, this is thy victory;
O Soul, this is thy peace!

That is the hero's ending, the moral of the poem, and the word of the allegory. But it is not all the matter of *The Serpent Play*. Another personage, or rather another type of human destiny, is shown in the soldier, Voragine. He is brave, honest, a good man according to his lights. But his lights are dim, and they show him but the earth at his feet. He descends on his discovery, and he conquers it; and he dies for ever in the moment of victory. Yet another result of life is exemplified in the personage of

Hayus, the priest of Kausis, who is merely the world incarnate, and whose doom is one of seeming triumph and of actual self-slaughter and eternal destruction. Side by side with these are Vivia, the sister of Cœlis and the mate of Voragine, and Volupsa, Voragine's sister, and the spiritual mistress of Cœlis. They represent, it may be assumed, two several expressions of the *Ewig-weibliches*—the one, that of sweet, whole-hearted, and unconscious mortality; the other, that of innate perfectibility. The scheme of symbolization is completed in the personages of Psyche, the Soul of Universal Love, and Kausis, the immemorial Serpent. Of the intricacy in which this allegory of spiritual destiny is conveyed we do not purpose to speak at any length. It is fragmentary, and it is somewhat obscure—two faults which no allegory can have and succeed. For the rest, it must be remembered that, both as art and as intention, *The Serpent Play* affords a striking contrast to the best and greatest of all allegories. In *The Pilgrim's Progress* everything is human, everything is near and homely, everything is real; the motive is of the commonest and simplest; the parallel and the illustrations are part of the stuff of everyday existence; the purport is inseparably associated with a thousand venerable and familiar ordinances, a thousand admirable and trivial experiences, a thousand earnest and commonplace ambitions. In *The Serpent Play* we have quitted the world for the spirit of man; we have left beneath us all particular forms of faith, and have risen as it were above religion; we are no longer face to face with breathing realities, but with intellectual conceptions of realities; we have parted with things material and near, and come to quarters with things transcendental and remote. The ambition is a noble one, and has resulted in a noble piece of work, but a piece of work that, as we think, is only partly successful.

Of the many individual beauties of *The Serpent Play* we have no space to speak as they deserve; nor have we space to enlarge upon its faults of style, though they are neither few nor inconsiderable. Among the latter are such verses as these:—

In the blue night whose calm the scene invests
But not the listener's wretchedness arrests;
and these:—

My own Red Rose!
My Lily of the Vale!
Your cheeks, how blooming!
Yours, why are they pale?

Among the former are such examples of the "epic touch," or what is left of it, as this:—

The moon is at the full and overflows,
The wheat is gathered into sheaves,
And heaven its quiet brilliance throws
On reapers who from toil repose
On the warm ground, with flocks and bees.
They, tired of grazing; tired of reaping;
O'er all the harvest moon is sleeping; . . .
Time moves not, sharing in their peace,
And loitering o'er the yellow land.

This is like a Claude in words. Equally memorable in another way is this one:—

Volupsa knows the wanderer's haunt, and strays
By paths wherein she feels his heart hath spoken;
and this one:—

He seeks
For the unseen like one who searched the world
For some lost friend.

The far-reaching, human suggestiveness of these two passages could not, we take it, be readily paralleled.

In *Pearls of the Faith*, completing the fine Oriental trilogy of which the first two numbers are the *Light of Asia* and the *Indian Song of Songs*, we change scenes, live a new life, breathe a different atmosphere. The sub-title of the book, "Islam's Rosary," describes it exactly. It is neither more nor less than a translation into English verse of the Ninety-nine Beautiful Names, with descendants, legendary or didactic, on each one of them. It is excellent reading; not so much for its literary quality, which is no more than respectable, as for the singular beauty and humanity of much of its material. "It does but aim," says Mr. Arnold, "to suggest (in poetic form) juster thoughts than sometimes prevail of Islam, of its founder, and of its votaries"; and in this it should be completely successful. The numbers of the Rosary itself are usually prosaic in expression, unattractive in cadence, and terribly hampered with transliterations from the Arabic; the verse throughout is hardly that of a great poet; the didactics are seldom very moving or impressive. But the interest, the nobility, and the charm of many of the legends are beyond argument, as the magnificent humanity of some of them—that, for instance, of Salah-ud-Deen and the Adulteress—is beyond praise. Chief among them are "The Verity of Sayid," an admirable story very well and simply told, "Abraham's Offence," "Ali and the Jew," the "Adulteress" aforesaid, "The History of Ozair," and "King Sheddâd's Paradise." There is not one, however, that is not in some sort remarkable; there is not one but conveys some excellent and touching morality; there is not one but will be read with pleasure, or with admiration and emotion. Mr. Arnold has done well in bringing them together in a form acceptable and attractive to the general reader—so well, indeed, as to deserve the thanks of all who are interested in good morals and good literature.

IT WAS A LOVER AND HIS LASS.*

IT was a Lover and his Lass is a book towards which, from the moment of seeing the first page of it, the reader feels amiably disposed. It is very satisfactory to find Mrs. Oliphant once more writing about Scotch scenery and character; and it is (if she and still more a recent well-intentioned defender of hers in *Blackwood* will forgive us) still more satisfactory not to have her writing about English literature. It is true that, as with all Mrs. Oliphant's later novel work, the reader must not be unreasonable. He must not expect more story, or more character, or more description than is necessary to carry him smoothly from the first page of Volume I. to the last page of Volume III., and he must not lose his temper if the motive power sometimes seems to flag a very little. But he will find less of this extreme economy of material and workmanship in *It was a Lover and his Lass* than in most of its author's recent books. Indeed there is a very fair supply of minor characters and a kind of adumbration of a second plot. The sole real fault which can be found with *It was a Lover and his Lass* as a novel, not of extraordinary genius, but of workmanlike talent a long way above the average, is one which has to be found so often with English novels that the critic is almost weary of noticing it. Almost the whole of the second volume might with advantage have been boiled down into a couple of chapters or thereabouts and put into the first and third. But apparently the public or the publishers, or something and somebody powerful and stupid, will have it so. A Jockey Club that will do away with five-furlong spurts, and a Publishers' League that will boycott three-volume novels, are the opposite, but not inharmonious, desires of intelligent lovers of English racing and English fiction. If we had an Academy, it might offer a Grand Prix Gobert to the shortest novel. But there would be obvious difficulties in settling the rules of the game.

The plot of *It was a Lover and his Lass*, if not entirely novel, has nevertheless a fair appearance of novelty. An old Scotch baronet of ancient family offends his children and grandchildren by ruining himself in building a palace in Perthshire, which is never finished. He recovers a large fortune, but, indignant at what he thinks his son's undutifulness, he leaves to his grandchildren (for the son dies before him) only a bare pittance beyond the small property settled on them, and bequeaths the whole remainder of his fortune to a boy, the orphan child of an English consular clerk, whom he has picked up by accident on the Continent. This boy, Lewis Grantley, or Lewis Murray (for his benefactor has left him name as well as wealth), has been brought up in the best English and foreign society abroad, but has never visited England, and has hardly any distinct idea of his patron's family and affairs. At the age of five-and-twenty he finds himself to his surprise an extremely rich man, and still more to his surprise discovers that he is regarded by a family of ladies in distant Scotland as a robber and usurper of their rights and property. He forms the idea of healing the breach by marriage with one of them, and it is in the carrying out of this idea (not in itself, as we have said, a very novel one) with due vicissitudes that the story consists. Mrs. Oliphant may be congratulated on Lewis Grantley, who is a successful character as he is, and who only just comes short of being a remarkably successful one. His English nature and his Continental education combine, with a happier result than that of a similar combination recorded in the old story of the wise and ugly knight and the beautiful but foolish girl. He has the simplicity, the freedom from snobbishness, the natural and unconstrained manners and impulses, which are theoretically supposed to belong to the best type of "foreigner," together with the sincerity and the moral cleanliness which we Englishmen are good enough to attribute to ourselves at our best. At the same time Mrs. Oliphant has not committed the fault of making him a faultless monster. He is merely a very amiable, natural, and extremely unconventional young man. The interest of the first part of the book consists in his finding himself in the entirely novel surroundings of the Scotch village of Murkley, the home of the family whose Jacob he is, and where he goes to spy out the land, without of course declaring himself, but at the same time without any actual disguise. He first, under an erroneous idea, pays his addresses to the second sister, Miss Jean, who is eight-and-thirty, but whose good nature and good sense cut this awkward knot. Then he transfers his suit and (it can hardly be said transfers, but confers) his affections on Lilius, the youngest, the heiress, or who should have been the heiress. The impediments thrown in the way of this by the eldest sister, Margaret—another excellent character—furnish the proper difficulties. But it is before Margaret Murray discovers Grantley's identity (which makes her more furious with him than ever) that the most amusing situation of the book occurs, and the most artificially arranged. The Murrays of Murkley have an almost ultra-Scotch belief in the greatness and importance of their own family; and though Margaret has herself seen something of society in her youth, long seclusion and brooding have distorted her view. Accordingly, when they go up to London to present Lilius at Court, a dire disappointment awaits them. A few strictly local and private entertainments are open to them, but the inner circle of society is closed, and they cannot gain access to the great parties of the season. Then it is that, to Margaret's surprise and horror, the unknown Lewis Murray, whom she has treated, though still ignorant of his main crime, with

* *It was a Lover and his Lass.* By Mrs. Oliphant. 3 vols. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1883.

superb disdain in Perthshire as a nobody, steps in and opens to the pre-Adamite Murrays of Murkley the charmed abodes, the key of which he, as the acknowledged heir of a man of family and fortune who kept open house on the Continent, has long possessed. This poetical justice is excellent, and the result ("le mal moral endurcit le cœur," as Lord Chesterfield says or quotes) is in Margaret's case quite in accordance with experience and psychology.

These successful strokes in the plot are very well seconded by details of character and incident. The opening description of the peculiarly fantastic and unreal effect of a Scotch twilight, or rather absence of twilight, in summer is good enough in itself, and perfectly true to nature. The host of the "Murkley Arms"—a philosopher and a fisherman, but accustomed, like primitive man, to leave everything but the chase to his wife—is an excellent example of his kind, though perhaps a little caricatured. His sententious observation, "Whiles an unconscionable question like this young gentleman's will just let loose a thocht," is, for instance, almost, yet not more than almost, a burlesque of a certain class of Scotch utterance. But he deserves a longer citation. Lewis has been questioning the pair on the exact English or Scotch acceptation of that difficult word "gentleman," and Janet, the hostess, has answered a remark of her husband's by a gibe about his own do-nothingness:—

"What do you ca' that thing the auld heathens fired as they fled, sir?" said Adam, as Janet disappeared. "A Parthian arrow? You're just it. It's naething to the argument, but it has its effect. It doesn't convince your mind, but it makes a kind of end of your debating. It's just a curious question enough what makes a gentleman. I canna tell ye, for my part. I'm maybe mair worth in many ways than a lad like you, not meaning any offence. I've come through mair, I have pondered mair—but pit me in your claes and you in mine, and it woud be you that would be the gentleman still. I canna fadom it: but that's not remarkable, for there are few things I can fadom on this earth. The mair I ponder, the less I come to any end."

"All the philosophers are the same," said Lewis. "You are not singular, my friend Adam. But how do you know I am a gentleman, come? I might be nothing of the sort. You never saw me till ten days ago. It is not the clothes, you admit, and you feel that you are better man than I. Then why do you take it for granted that I am a gentleman? You have no evidence."

"Maister Murray," said Adam, somewhat grimly, "evidence has little, awfu' little to do with it. Maybe you're one of them that thinks with Locke there are nae innate ideas? But I'm of the Scotch school, sir; I'm no demanding dafta dafta for ever, like your Baconian lads. Let us be, and we'll come down to your facks, and fit them a' in to a miracle. It's just a brutal method, in my opinion, to demand the facks first, and syne account for them and explain them a' away."

"You are abandoning the point more than your wife did," cried Lewis. "Come! how do you know?"

"I know naething about it," said Adam, turning away. "I'll argue my ain gait or I'll no argue at all. Your personal questions are naething to a true philosopher. This I'll tell ye, if a man canna be kent for a gentleman without proving it, it's my opinion he's nae gentleman ava. And I'm for a turn before the night closes in," said Adam, suddenly.

Doubting Thomases, who are as the sapper to whom nothing is sacred, may ask whether, with all Mrs. Oliphant's knowledge of her own countrymen, this character does not owe something to Kingsley's Sandy Mackaye. But there is no necessity to examine that question too narrowly.

We have said that there is something of an underplot, out of which Mrs. Oliphant contrives to get another contrast of situation in a skilful enough fashion, but which does not, on the whole, please us. The actors here are Philip Stormont, a cocklaird, and neighbour to the Murrays, whose scheming mother is very anxious that he should marry Lilius, and Katie Seton, the minister's daughter, whose opinion of the said Philip is considerably higher than he deserves. Mrs. Stormont herself is good; though Mrs. Oliphant has rather shown her claws (if it may be permitted to hint that a lady has claws) in drawing her; and Katie, a lively, coquettish, good-natured, but somewhat egotistical and light-minded, Scotch girl, is also a capital picture. But Philip Stormont is rather spoilt by the obvious intention to make him in all things a contrast to Lewis. His English awkwardness and grumpiness balances Grantley's amiable polish, his sturdy sportsmanship Grantley's rather effeminate dilettantism, his pliancy to his mother's will Grantley's real constancy under an easy-going exterior. All this is too complete and exact a correspondence of opposition to be natural and probable. Moreover, it is partly, though not wholly, to this under plot that the *longueurs* of the second volume are due. A certain Stormont ball in that volume occupies in its preparations, incidents, and consequences nearly, if not quite, as much space as the theatricals in *Mansfield Park*, which, whatever may be the opinion of some people, we have never been able to accept as one of Miss Austen's happiest ideas, and it has not nearly so much to do with the plot. At the same time it is fair to say that it gives occasion for much that is amusing. The conversation of the Murrays, Setons, and Stormonts is perhaps better than anything the author has done since the days of *The Chronicles of Carlingford*, when it is at its best; but it is not always at its best, and there is decidedly too much of it. With fear and trembling, but from some actual observation, a Southern critic may perhaps hint a doubt whether Mrs. Oliphant has not peppered her countrywomen's talk somewhat too heavily with "jests." That expletive is an acknowledged feature of Scotch talk, but it is, we think, unusual for ladies of the rank of the Miss Murrays to use it in every sentence or nearly so. Some of the social satire in the London part is also decidedly conventional, an unfortunate defect which is frequently observable in social satire, especially in that of lady novelists. The scene is laid at an uncer-

tain period "before photographs were common." But did men use the phrase "bad form" before photographs were common? Our memory inclines us to think not. This, however, is hardly a heinous shortcoming, and indeed none of the shortcomings of *It was a Lover and his Lass* are heinous, while its merits are sufficiently decided.

SEEBOHM'S HISTORY OF BRITISH BIRDS.*

THE mere announcement of a new book on British Birds will not, we think, arouse more than a languid interest in the minds of ornithologists. The literature of the subject is already so extensive that an author must indeed be able to show good cause why he should add another voluminous or expensive work to their overburdened shelves. It is, therefore, in a somewhat critical spirit that we have received this Part I. of Mr. Seebohm's *History of British Birds*; and although by his *Siberia in Europe* and *Siberia in Asia* he has given evidence of his powers of observation as an accomplished naturalist, we sat down to an examination of this more important work with a steady resolution to discover all possible errors, and point out faults with an unsparing hand. That our attempt has been only partially successful is perhaps the highest compliment we can pay the author. The part issued, the first of six, is of a not too large size, with a clear bright type; the illustrations are as nearly perfect as the most careful colour-printing can produce, rivaling—and it is no slight praise—the admirable egg-pictures of Hewitson, some of which might almost have been executed by hand; and the book is written in an easy, pleasant style, redolent of the field rather than of the study. What more can we desire? And if as a book on British birds it stood alone, instead of coming as an addition to an already ample literature, we might have accepted it with gratitude; but unfortunately it has a defect which we cannot but think will go far to interfere with its favourable reception. It is the opprobrium of ornithology that its professors have never yet been able to agree upon an identical system of classification and nomenclature; the consequent confusion in the minds of students which their diversities have caused can hardly be overestimated. Birds, whatever their ancestral reptilian affinities, are, as one of the large divisions of the animal kingdom, sufficiently distinctive; but among themselves they are not separated by such strong leading characters as are the mammalia, their internal organization is not so varied, nor have even their higher subdivisions the same clearly-marked divergencies. The attempt to arrange and classify forms in their aggregate so protean has never yet been rewarded with more than a limited measure of success. Systematists, one after the other, have as yet persistently disagreed, and Mr. Seebohm has not cared to depart from the unfortunate precedent, but, with probably the best possible motives, has done his part towards our further bewilderment.

As a science ornithology may be said to have been the creation of Belon, in the year 1555; the first author in whom we find anything like the elements of classification on this subject. His work, remarkable for the period when it was written, contains some very just ideas concerning the analogy of structure between birds and mammals, more especially in his comparison of the skeletons. Gesner, in 1556, in his Birds of Switzerland attempted apparently to restore the reign of obscurity by an alphabetical arrangement. Aldrovandus (1599-1603) recognized the difficulties inseparable from any system when he defined one of his "families" as composed of "birds of a middle nature, between birds properly so-called and quadrupeds, as the ostrich and the bat." Willoughby, in 1678, so far anticipated modern science that he selected the forms of the beak and feet as the basis of his divisions, and used the habits and modes of subsistence as distinctive of his groups. In this he was followed by Ray (1713), and, however imperfect in its details, the *Synopsis methodica* as a whole was rational, and, what is as much to the purpose, is workable. Barrère, in 1741, was successful only in recalling the era of confusion which prevailed until Linnaeus, who, like Willoughby, selected as the chief distinctions the forms of the beak and of the feet, and in justice to that renowned naturalist it must be acknowledged that his classification is one of the best that have ever been published, in respect to the division and subdivision of orders. Brisson (1760) proposed to arrange the whole genera by their toes, their number and position. Later, Viellot (1820), deciding that the characteristics of the beak referred to as indices were inapplicable to something like one-fifth of the whole, attempted to substitute for the Linnaean a system composed of five orders and fifty-eight families, among which he distributed new and almost unintelligible names, unnecessarily adding to the already portentous list of synonyms; the absurdity of his system appearing to culminate in his Order Grallatores, described with happy comprehensiveness as "Birds with feet moderate or long, robust or slender" and with bills, influenced no doubt by the imperfectly understood laws of correlation, "of various shapes." Lacépède divides birds into two large classes, relying for their distinctive character on the presence or absence of feathers upon the leg, and these again into forty orders marked by variations in the beak. Vigors improved upon the Linnaean system so far that his classification is still of value, though the position he assigns to the questionable group Scansores (toucans, parrots, cuckoos, &c.) is unsatisfactory. No one of these

* *A History of British Birds; with Coloured Illustrations of their Eggs.*
By Henry Seebohm. Part I. London: R. R. Porter and Dulau & Co. 1883.

systems—and the list is very incomplete—can be regarded as anything more than provisional. MacGillivray boldly set aside, as deserving of only secondary consideration, the distinctive characters previously relied upon, and adopted the intestinal canal as his "central point of reference," claiming for his system that the study of the internal organization of birds would be found a much easier task than the observation of their habits, manners, distribution, and migrations; and, with amusing gravity, he contrasts the little labour and less expense which one would involve, as compared with the laborious, expensive, and somewhat dangerous expeditions necessitated by the other. We know from experience that the study of the structure—i.e. dissection—is neither the delightful nor satisfactory occupation he describes; it is not every one who can by "simply inspecting the intestinal canal invariably refer a bird to its proper species." We suspect that such inspection in regard to the family of which the thrushes form perhaps the central group would occasionally perplex even the most practised anatomist; but fatal to the adoption of the system would be the ghastly array in our Museum galleries when its results and illustrations were prepared for exhibition, and when, instead, it might be, of the cases of Gould's Humming Birds, in all the jewelled glory of their plumage, the Curators arranged for the delectation of visitors a complete series of their "central points of reference," dried, injected, or in spirits. Nitzsch in the early part of the present century devised an almost equally ingenious system. He demonstrated that, on denuding a bird of its feathers, the whole plumage would be found localized according to some definite plan, and that between the "feather-tracts," Federn-fluren, were naked intervening "bands," Federn-raine. The variation in the occurrence or plan of these tracts and bands formed the basis of his classification. His system was not received with favour by ornithologists, probably because the occurrence of bands, Federn-raine, in unexpected places, such as on the head of the woodpecker and cockatoo, or at the base of the beak and on the throat of the rook, created too many exceptions to his rules, and perhaps, too, because a collection of birds denuded of their feathers would prove of doubtful attraction, even to the initiated.

Omitting a long list of names of men more or less eminent—Gmelin, Temminck, Leach, Shaw, Slater—and turning to those whose chief merit lies in illustration, though variations of system are here of less moment, "many men many minds" still seems the prevailing rule. Alvin (1731) is interesting only from the quaintness of what he terms his "Paintings." They were, he tells us, "done from the Life, with all the exactness I could either with my own Hand or my Daughter's"; and, if not drawn with perfect accuracy, very lifelike in his painting of the vulture, "the Eagle of the Sun," "a fierce and very bold bird, that will strike at anything that comes near," and whose acquaintance he made at "Tottenham Court Fair." But for his assurance, we should have doubted whether his "Greenland Dove," a bird like a fat pigeon, with short conical bill and webbed feet, was also "done from the Life." Bewick, so charming in his artistic work, was not a systematist. Meyer, Morris, and Dresser, in their coloured illustrations of birds, were all trying to accomplish an impossibility; no colour-painting can represent the exquisite tints in the plumage of many of our birds; bronze or sober black is no substitute for the iridescent hues of the darker feathers of the swift or of the starling. The least unsuccessful are, perhaps, those in Mr. Sharpe's Catalogue; but pictures of birds, however exact, do not make a science; and our conclusion is one to which Mr. Seeböhm himself assents, that in the classification of birds there are no external characters so misleading as the forms of the beak and feet; except perhaps those of the wings and tail; and, to confirm our opinion as to the imperfection of all recognized systems, we quote the author's remarks on the extensive family of Passeridae, or singing birds; they are, he says,

separated from the other families to which they are most nearly allied by a peculiar structure of the singing apparatus at the lower end of the windpipe; but this apparently exhausts the anatomical characters which our physiologists have been able to discover, and leaves us with nearly half the known species of birds so closely related to each other that no known internal characters exist by which they may be subdivided.

We recognize the advantages (on paper) of using the generic and specific names which may prevail with ornithologists; we are willing to acknowledge (also on paper) the value and weight of all evidence in favour of varying or rejecting those names; but, as we consider that the only object for which a code of nomenclature exists at all is to enable the naturalist to indicate, without any doubt or mistake, the special example under description, we would respectfully urge that all discussion be confined to the pages of the *Ibis*, and that for the present, and until ornithologists are agreed—a consummation which, to judge by the past, may be postponed to the days of our grandchildren—some arrangement and nomenclature with which we are familiar shall be rigidly adhered to. We have this already in Yarrell's *History of British Birds*, of which a new edition, one-half completed, is now passing through the press. The first editor, Professor Newton, than whom no one more competent could have undertaken the task, has retired, and is succeeded by Mr. Howard Saunders, whose knowledge of the avi-fauna of Southern Europe is only equalled by Mr. Seeböhm's acquaintance with the Northern forms. In Yarrell the birds are "done from the Life," with the accuracy and clearness of detail which distinguishes all Mr. Van Voorst's publications; Mr. Seeböhm's pictures of their eggs can hardly be surpassed. Is there no hope of an agreement? In the part under review but one-seventh of the whole number of our British birds is described; surely in

the succeeding parts the work which already occupies the ground might be accepted. The advantage to all except the sternest systematists would be incalculable, and amid the general chorus of satisfaction their few and feeble ululations might be disregarded.

What is the rule by which stray visitants to our shores are accepted or rejected? Apparently Mr. Seeböhm admits all which have been described by Yarrell, or perhaps suggested by Eyton. Both have placed the Griffon Vulture on their list; but, with the exception of the example seen by Alvin "at Tottenham Court Fair," one instance only of its occurrence is recorded. Pennant, in 1810, saw and pictured two specimens of the "Angola vulture" captured in Wales. One of these, twenty years later, was, we are told, in the British Museum. Mr. Seeböhm does not notice it. He describes the swallow-tailed kite which has twice wandered here. The black kite can only claim rank as a British bird from one having been trapped in 1866, and it had probably escaped from an aviary. Rare visitants among the smaller birds, such as the Siberian ground thrush and the desert chat, may more readily be admitted, since for one that comes within range of binocular or double-barrel, a hundred may remain in happier obscurity. It is not so with the larger birds which have the temerity to visit our shores, and least of all with the ever-persecuted accipitres. We notice that the measurements of birds are not given, while the eggs are carefully drawn to size, and their dimensions recorded. Every schoolboy knows, or used to know before the Wild Birds' Preservation Acts put a stop to the joys of birdnesting, that birds of a somewhat similar size lay eggs which vary in a very remarkable degree. Thus, while the guillemot and the raven are of about equal proportions, their eggs are nearly as 10 to 1. So with the curlew and the rook, where the variation is as 6 or even 8 to 1. The cuckoo, about one-fourth larger than the ring plover, lays an egg which does not much exceed that of the smaller bird selected as an unwitting foster-parent, while the ring plover can only, by keeping their conical ends together, cover the four large eggs which fill her nest. Mr. Seeböhm has given an admirable account of a marauding expedition after the eggs of the griffon vultures in southern Spain; but we must take exception to his conclusion that a visit to the nests of these foul-feeding birds is sufficient to dispose for ever of the theory that they hunt by scent. The entire absence of olfactory nerves is, he thinks, the only condition on which, amid such overpowering evil smells, any animal life is possible. The arguments on either side are singularly balanced. Though his conclusion is supported by the experiments of Audubon, Bachmann, and Darwin, Professor Owen has, by actual dissection, shown that the olfactory nerves of the turkey buzzard, an allied species, are very highly developed; and Waterton and others have given instances in which the keen intelligence of similar birds in the discovery of putrid flesh could not possibly have been acquired by sight. One charm the book must claim; even when the information it contains is not due to the writer's own personal knowledge, it is "assimilated" with great skill, and reads like his own, so thoroughly does he convey the impression that he is a keen and practical observer; hence are we spared the repetition of oft-told tales, sometimes wearisome, generally apocryphal, such as that which Yarrell borrowed from the English edition of Cuvier, where it is related, on the authority of "Smith," how a Kerry peasant secured a perilous subsistence by robbing the young eagles of the food brought to them by their parents. The Kerry peasant need not now incur these risks, since a higher political morality has succeeded in giving a safer and more profitable direction to his predatory instincts.

BUDDHIST LITERATURE IN CHINA.*

THE contents of the present work are suggestive of the great strides which we have made of late years in our knowledge of Buddhism. Not very long ago the very name even of Buddha was unknown among us. In our religious pride we were content to divide the world into two classes, Christians and Heathens, much as in old times the children of Israel spoke of "Jews and Gentiles," and the Athenians of "Greeks and Barbarians," and it was not until Mr. Brian Hodgson discovered Sanskrit Buddhist manuscripts in Nepal that we gained any comprehensive knowledge of a religious system which held enthralled one-fourth of the human race. The discovery of Pali Buddhist manuscripts was even of later date, and the attention of students has only within the last few years been directed to the translations into Chinese of the Indian Sūtras.

To M. Julien, Mr. Beal, and Dr. Edkins belongs the distinction of having pointed out the value of this new light in the study of Buddhism, and to the initiative of Mr. Beal it is due that, through the instrumentality of Iwakura Tomomi, the Japanese Minister in London, the India Office has lately become possessed of a copy of the Chinese version of the Tripitaka. Having made a careful study of this collection, Mr. Beal chose its contents for the subject of his Four Lectures delivered last year at University College, of which the present volume is an abstract. The choice was a fortunate one. To all but a small class of minds the study of Buddhism is of great interest. The loftiness of its aims and the purity of its doctrines invest it with sanctity, and the millions of worshippers who kneel at its shrines testify to the power it possessed of satisfy-

* Abstract of Four Lectures on Buddhist Literature in China, delivered at University College, London. By Samuel Beal. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

ing the spiritual wants at least of Asiatics. The rapidity with which it spread throughout India, and again through Tibet, China, Japan, Burmah, and Siam, is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of religions. Mr. Beal ascribes the rapid introduction of the new religion into China to the instrumentality of the Vajjis of Vesali—the Yue-chi of Chinese history—who during the lifetime of Buddha were settled in the neighbourhood of Magadha, and who were converted to his creed by means of his preaching. Fired with the proverbial zeal of converts, these Northerners, Mr. Beal supposes, spread the knowledge of their new faith among their countrymen in Mongolia, from whom, again, the first news of a "Holy man in the West" was borne to the Chinese Emperor Ming-ti in the year 60 A.D.

At this time Confucianism and Taoism had held sway for more than four centuries. The birthplace of Confucius had become a hallowed spot, at which Emperors offered sacrifices in his honour. Posthumous titles had been conferred upon him, and his teachings had become regarded as sacred utterances. In these circumstances it is strange to find the ready reception which Buddhism met with. In answer to an imperial mission sent by the Emperor Ming-ti to India, the Buddhist priests Kasyapa, Matanga, and Dharmānanda visited China laden with books, which they translated into Chinese. Following in the wake of these men came a succession of missionaries, who with marked ability and untiring energy imparted the wonderful contents of their Sūtras to Chinese readers through the medium of translations. With corresponding zeal Chinese converts made pilgrimages to India, whence they returned laden with books and relics. One of the most noted of these was I-tsing, who embarked at Canton on his voyage westward in the seventh century. This man, we are told, landed with his books on the banks of the river Loh, which thus, for the second time after an interval of more than three thousand years, delivered up books which have moulded the fortunes and influenced the destinies of the people of China.

Apart from the light which the translations thus made throw on the meaning of the Sanskrit and Pali versions of the same Sūtras, they supply fresh materials for the inquiry as to the languages or dialects in which the texts from which they were taken were written. Mr. Beal considers that, assuming the originals were in either Sanskrit or Pali, the difficulty of reconciling the transcriptions of Indian names is insuperable, and he suggests as an explanation that the translations were made from various Indian Prakrits. In support of this supposition he points out that "for the Sanskrit *Savatthi*, the early Chinese Buddhist books have the Prakrit form *Savatthi*, for *Stūpa* we find *tāp*." But these instances are by no means conclusive, and the varieties they display may just as readily have arisen from Chinese dialectical differences of pronunciation as from the cause to which Mr. Beal attributes them. In the arrangement and divisions of some texts, however, there is evidence to show that the translations into Chinese were made at least from differing versions of the originals. Thus among the books of Southern Canon, the first *Sutta* in the Chinese version of the *Samyutta Nikāya* is the same as the *Kasibhāradvīja Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta*, which last is, however, a portion of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* in the South, and not of the *Samyutta Nikāya*. Again, according to M. Julien, there are four versions in Chinese of the *Lalita Vistara*; and Mr. Beal has discovered three different texts of a work known as *Dhammadapada*, all of which bear unmistakable evidences of having been derived from one common parent. In the case of the *Lalita Vistara*, Mr. Beal points out that one translation was made by an Indo-Scyth of the name of Dharmaraksha, who, we are told, travelled through India and the neighbouring countries, and "understood the dialects, and could read the books of thirty-six countries." Supposing, then, that the Buddhist Sūtras existed in the Prakrits, of which, however, there is no positive evidence whatever, there is nothing improbable in Mr. Beal's suggestion that this accomplished student should have made his translation from an original in one of the thirty-six dialects with which he was acquainted. In comparing the account of the first Buddhist Council held at Rājagrīha in the Pali, Sarvāstādin, and Dharmagupta versions of the *Vinaya Pitaka*, Mr. Beal finds that in the first the account of the cremation of Buddha's body is entirely wanting, that in the Sarvāstādin text the whole history of the event is given, with the division of the relics, and the circumstances connected with the erection of Stūpas over them, while in the Dharmagupta version there is but a bare allusion to these matters. These, with many other proofs which might be adduced, point conclusively to the fact that at the beginning of our era there existed different texts of the Buddhist Sūtras in India; but direct evidence of their having been any in anything but Sanskrit and Pali is entirely wanting.

Mr. Beal deals at some length with the vexed question of Nirvāna, and interprets the word by its Chinese equivalent, *Woo wei*, "non-being," which he considers "seems to point to a breathless or non-creative state of existence." This suggestion may be said to find support in the practice employed both by Buddhists and Brahmins of suppressing their breath "when in a state of profound religious thought or ecstasy, as indicating a brief return to the condition of perfect and unfettered being." But in the Chinese expression there is no reference whatever to a breathless state beyond the implication suggested by a condition of non-being. Nirvāna is, however, invariably described as a condition incapable of beginning or ending, and so far corresponding, as Mr. Beal

points out, to the Egyptian description of Kneph, "τὸ δύναμις καὶ τὸ δέαρον."

There is much in these lectures on the teachings of Buddha and the general scope of his system which will repay study; but the last of the series, in which the author points out certain coincidences between Buddhism and other religious systems, is undoubtedly the most generally interesting. According to Buddhist tradition, the earth, which is divided into four large islands, is surrounded by the ocean. In the centre of one of these islands, named Jambudvīpa, is a lake-surrounded island, which is the abode of a Nāga. From the dwelling of this Nāga "proceed four refreshing rivers, which compass Jambudvīpa. At the east side of the lake, from the mouth of a silver ox, flows out the Ganges river. After compassing the lake once it enters the sea towards the south-east. From the south side of the lake, from the mouth of a golden elephant, flows the Sindhu river. After compassing the lake once it enters the sea on the south-west. On the west side of the lake, flowing from the mouth of a horse of lapis-lazuli, flows the river Oxus, which, after compassing the lake once, enters the sea on the north-west. On the south side of the lake, flowing from the mouth of a crystal lion, flows the river Sīdā, which, after making one circuit, flows into the sea on the north-east." It is impossible not to see in this description a form of the ancient tradition respecting the four rivers flowing out of Eden, nor to recognize in the account given in p. 149 of the Golden City on the top of Mount Sumeru, with its gates, palaces, and tree of life, a reflection of the record of the "great city, the holy Jerusalem," on the "great and high mountain."

The resemblance between the Buddhist and Homeric cosmogonies is more minute. Like the Greek poet, the Buddhists consider, as is mentioned above, that the earth is surrounded by the "flowings of ocean." The zones of Mount Sumeru, the Olympus of their system, are ruled over by successive demi-gods, the first of whom is the god "Strong-hand," or "Bull-hand" (Vṛishapāni), corresponding to the Greek Helios. The ruler over the next zone is the "Chaplet-holder," or the *Stāra*. Above him comes "The ever-free," i.e. the Moon; and at the crest and around the plateau we find

four elemental gods . . . keeping the gate of heaven, and concerned in the affairs of men. These are, under one aspect, the Horse of Homer; under another, the four elements. On the south, Virudhaka, the productive earth (*ἀρουρα*, called by Homer πολύφορος; as in the Chinese, *Chang-tang*, the productive). On the west is the larger or distorted-eyed god (Viripāksa), corresponding with Air, represented under the form of the full moon, the queen of the night air. This title, *Viripāksa*, is in Chinese rendered "large eye," corresponding with the ox-eyed or large-eyed Juno. . . . On the north we have the element Fire figured under the name Vaisravana, the son of Vīrasava, "the celebrated." Here is plainly the Hephestos, the περικλυτός of Homer. . . . On the east is Dritarashtra, "he who holds his kingdom," i.e. all-embracing water, the γαγόχος Ιοπειδῶν of Homer. Above all and over all is the Divine Sākra, "the powerful," the Cloud-driver or Cloud-compeller. . . . This deity is described as having a palace on the very top of Meru (ἀκρόπατη κορυφῆ), whilst the gods (Οὐρανοὶ δέματα ἔχοντες) dwell around him.

It is needless to say that no such cosmogony takes form in the teachings of Buddha himself. Like many other grafted traditions, this one was derived by the later schools from contact with followers of other gods, from whom they borrowed much, in exchange for which they, no doubt, imparted portions of their own system. Buddhist missionaries and others travelled, as we know, far and wide throughout the ancient world; and there is nothing improbable, therefore, in the supposition that they became acquainted with, and adopted as their own, the myths of Greece. From the same source, or possibly from the North of Europe, whither, according to M. Hölmboe, Buddhism had penetrated before the Christian era, the solar myth has been introduced into the Buddhist worship, one proof of which is furnished by the facsimile frontispiece to Mr. Beal's book, in which Buddha is figured as the sun rising above the hills. Recognizing this fact, M. Senart has, perhaps somewhat hastily, arrived at the conclusion that Sākyamuni is nothing more than the personification of the sun. Fortunately, however, like the Hyperboreans, we can get behind the north wind of these traditions; and, being thus able to trace Buddhism from the first appearance of its founder, there is no difficulty in giving them their proper place in the later and debased developments of the religion.

Mr. Beal further points out some striking similarities between the doctrines of the Essenes and those of the Buddhists. Altogether his work is one of great interest. Though some of the philological arguments contained in it may be of doubtful scientific value, there can be no question either as to the importance of the information with which its pages abound, or the suggestiveness of the numerous parallels drawn between Buddhism and the other religions of the Eastern world.

MINOR NOTICES.

ONE of the most beautiful and attractive French books of the winter publishing season of 1882 was M. Loredan Larchey's *Histoire du Gentil Seigneur de Bayard*, composée par le loyal Serviteur (1), which was brought out by Messrs. Hachette. A good English translation of this would have been a very good thing to issue. A so-called English translation is issued by Messrs.

(1) *History of Bayard*. Translated into English from the French of Loredan Larchey. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited.

Chapman & Hall; and the badness of it is amazing even to a reviewer whose lot it has been to see many strange translations of many works. It is so full of blunders as to be worse than worthless. This is a strong statement, and we must proceed to justify it by quotations. The pages given refer to the English volume. In p. 10 "fournit une carrière dedans ladite basse-cour" becomes "compelling it to circle round the said court"; in p. 29 "depuis par quelque temps" is "for ever after"; in p. 43 "grands chevaux" (i.e. chargers) is translated with a pleasing simplicity "great horses," and this ludicrous mistake is twice repeated; in p. 54 "je parviendrai à être au nombre des gens de bien" becomes "I may yet become one of the many great men." "Who had had dressed a triumphal supper" represents in p. 59 "qui avait fait dresser le souper triomphalement," and in p. 60 "From behind the barriers they thrust their lances dealing mighty blows" stands for "par-dessus la barrière à poussée de lance se ruèrent de grands coups." In p. 77 we hear of the "winner of three courses with the lance without a barrier," and to this is appended the absolutely irrelevant (as it at first seems) footnote, "At Brunnes the spot on which the camp of yore stood is still called Les Lices." Turning to the French we get the explanation. The words used in the text are *sans lice*, and the footnote runs thus:—"C'est-à-dire sans barrière. A Rennes la place qui servait autrefois de champ clos s'appelle encore Les Lices." The English, what with its wrongheadedness, its Brunnes for Rennes, and its camp for *champ clos*, must be admitted to be a very pretty bit of blundering. In page 81 for "on l'appelait la dame *intendio* (d'intelligence avec) du roi de France" we have "she was known by the name of the dame *intendio* (with intelligence) of the French king." Six pages later occurs this passage:—"Vraiment ! à cela ne tiendra pas, répondit le seigneur, 'car je vous en mets dehors présentement et ferai à votre maître.'" A footnote explains, "C'est-à-dire et ferai ce qu'il faudra pour cela près de celui qui vous a pris." The English translator takes no heed of the footnote, and with blundering stupidity writes, "In truth, think not of that, replied the lord, for I will presently send you forth to go unto your master." In p. 138 a pleasing little surprise awaits the reader. He finds that the French soldiers cried "You carry not off thus our *guidon*," and, turning to the French to see why Bayard was called a *cornet*, he finds "ainsi n'emmenez-vous pas la fleur de chevalerie." In p. 180 we hear that "Some irregulars were taken, the same being carried by force" (the italics are ours) "to the battlements, where they were hanged by the necks." The French is, "et y eut quelques rustres dedans pris, lesquels essayèrent si leur col pourroit par force emporter un crâneau." In p. 167 "for taking down and putting up these mouths of fire" represents "pour descendre et monter les bouches à feu"; and the same delightfully literal rendering is repeated in the next page, where also *boulets* is actually translated bullets. Page 175 is a very remarkable page in this monstrous mass of blunders. In it we learn that "The word *rustres* is synonymous with the word peasant now or plebeian. They were employed by the men-at-arms, and had the pride and discipline of a troop of regular horsemen, who gave their services to true gentlemen." Will it be believed that the original of this horrible nonsense is as follows?—"Rustre ne doit pas être pris en aussi mauvaise part qu'aujourd'hui. C'était un synonyme de *payson*, de *roturier*, employé par les hommes d'armes qui avait l'orgueil d'une troupe permanente de cavaliers que leur service rendait gentilshommes de droit." In p. 194 "car y avait trois jours que les canonniers ne tiraient qu'à pierre perdue en la ville" becomes "for for three days the gunners had not even sent a spent stone into the city." In p. 274 "dis-moi ma bonne aventure" becomes "tell me my good fortune." In the first page of this scandalous exhibition of ignorance and folly, "tous ceux qui content ce qu'ils ont vu" is actually rendered "like all those who are content with what is seen." In the last page, as in many others, there is a blunder the more mischievous because the English seems to make sense of a kind. It is, "On the other hand, at Mézières he does not appear at all so hampered by a command; but doubtless the place was in too bad a state for any one to desire that perilous honour." The French is "D'autre part, il ne parut point si géné de commander à Mézières; mais la place était trop mauvaise sans doute pour que personne voulût de ce périlleux honneur." It will be admitted that we have ample proved our case, and that it would be difficult to point to a more discreditable example of gross ignorance and reckless stupidity than is found in the pages of this so-called translation.

We can strongly recommend Major Morgan's summary (2) of minor tactics to the notice of military students. The work is concise and particularly clear; it is compiled by an experienced soldier who has seen rough service in the field, and the best authorities on the subject have been laid under contribution. It is certain to prove of great use to all those unfortunate beings who are the victims of the present craze for competitive examinations. One of their main difficulties hitherto in the way of mastering the subject has arisen from the diffuseness of writers, any amount of hair-splitting and wrangling on trivial points being esteemed allowable when discoursing on tactics. In the present summary will be found practical questions answered in sound common-sense fashion. An officer who thoroughly studies the work will find he has laid in a stock of valuable information which it would have taken a long time to acquire from other sources. We may

(2) *A Summary of Tactics*. By H. F. Morgan, late Captain 28th Regiment. London: Marcus Ward & Co.

especially commend the chapters on Woods and Villages as illustrating what we have said regarding brevity and lucidity in treatment of the subject.

Mr. Cross (3) supplies a want long felt by those whose duty it is to teach the Bible to the young. He gives in a short form and in simple language such elementary information about the character and contents of the Old Testament as may be gathered from the works of the best scholars of the present day. This he presents not in a dry series of lessons on biblical criticism, but in a singularly interesting narrative penetrated with a reverent and withal a fearless spirit. While maintaining that to teach negations is not to teach religion, and that essential truths should be believed with sincerity and taught with decision, he yet warns us that children should not be allowed to receive any "wrong impressions about the Bible, which may prove dangerous to their faith when they grow older," and should not be allowed to believe "that doubtful matters of history are part of a perfect Divine revelation, or that the morality and wisdom of a comparatively rude age are the highest attainable by mankind, because the record of them is to be found 'in the Bible.'" Mr. Cross's attempt stands alone in English theological literature, in that it gives in a popular form the results of modern scholarship as applied to the whole of the Old Testament. That it is abreast of the best scholarship is shown from its reception in Germany, where Professor Kamphausen, the most eminent Old Testament critic in Europe, pronounces it, in the *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, to be a "masterpiece which merits our most earnest attention." The method employed by Mr. Cross is to state candidly difficulties which can no longer be ignored, and then to dwell on the importance of the spiritual and moral truths which are independent of them. We may cite, as an illustration, his treatment of the story of the Fall. The idea of the Fall, he says, "might have been suggested by an attempt to explain the contradiction which we feel in life between the lofty aims and aspirations of man and his disappointing failures and hampered condition." Nevertheless, "whatever we think now of the origin and first meaning of it, whether we believe that it was intended from the first to be understood figuratively or not, it yet bears witness to the great law, to which common experience also bears such abundant testimony, that the consequences of wrongdoing do not end with the evil-doer, but spread in an ever-widening circle; and shows that men felt long ago, as we feel now, the essential imperfection of human nature, and the 'something wrong about this world' with which man has to struggle in pain and sorrow until the final enfranchisement from sin and evil, to which he has been taught to look forward as his true goal." Again, in a chapter on the composition of the Historical Books, he contends that the hypotheses of different writers as to the insertion of fragments of earlier works afford a solution to many difficulties which have long puzzled careful readers of the Bible. He places, for instance, the Elohistic and Jehovistic narratives of the Flood in parallel columns, and shows that great care was taken and much skill exercised in the endeavour to construct a consecutive narrative out of the different traditions and other materials with which the compilers had to deal. "It affords a striking proof of the respect with which the earlier reminiscences were treated by the literary workmen of later times, that they preferred to allow these pieces to stand exactly as they found them rather than to make alterations in them, even in cases where the inconsistencies between the component parts manifestly interfered with the success of their efforts to harmonize the whole." Nevertheless the general truth of biblical history is vindicated, as when he says that there can be no doubt that Abraham was a real historical character, and that the story of the Exodus is founded on fact and is true in its leading features. Mr. Cross has done for the Prophetic Books what has been recently done for Greek plays in the *Classics for English Readers*. He gives a graphic account of the contents of each book, and brings out the beauty of its details, and thus imparts to them quite a new interest. The passages on Nahum, Babylon, and "The Silent Land" are particularly good. The treatment of the Poetical Books is excellent throughout. Its general spirit may be indicated by the remarks on the Psalter when viewed as a modern book of devotion. In a collection of psalms made under an earlier religious dispensation, and in a state of society differing from our own, there will occur occasional passages that are obscure, and thoughts unsuitable to the religion of the present day; but, on the other hand, there is a great counter-balancing gain in the use of a book with so many historical associations:—"It is a bond of union between our faith and the faith of other days, when we remember the origin of these words of prayer and praise which we can still use. . . . Still, as of old, the spirit of man leans for rest upon the Eternal and the Infinite, and finds in communion with God the satisfaction of its deepest wants." There are other points on which we would gladly speak, sometimes agreeing, sometimes differing, from our author; but we are content to accept his caution, which reminds us that "there are many subjects connected with the Bible on which we may well be diffident in expressing an opinion when the wisest men and the best scholars are not agreed about them."

Mr. Busted (4) has made an eminently readable, entertaining,

(3) *Introductory Hints to English Readers of the Old Testament*. By the Rev. John A. Cross, M.A. London: Longmans.

(4) *Echoes from Old Calcutta; being chiefly Reminiscences of the days of Warren Hastings, Francis, and Impey*. By H. Busted. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, & Co. London: Thacker.

and by no means uninstructive, volume by going back to the beginning of things, or, in his own words, by going "to sources of information, mostly old and mouldy," and by turning the information thus industriously acquired to capital account. His book is at once accurate and lively, and contains not a few important corrections of errors which Macaulay has made popular. The papers on Nuncomar and on Francis may be specially recommended, but all the articles are good, and it is not too much to say that there is not a dull page in the book.

The seventh volume of Mr. Edwin Waugh's complete works (5) contains his fascinating and picturesque *Rambles in the Lake Country*.

Mr. Douglas brings out a new and attractive edition of that delightful and ever fresh book, *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* (6).

We have to note the appearance of *The Clergy List* (7) for 1883.

Mr. Sell, in a little volume on advertising, with which is combined a newspaper register (8), sets forth many curious facts and delivers various pieces of advice, which seem to be sound and practical, in connexion with the science of advertising.

Mr. Mollett's Dictionary of Art and Archaeology Terms (9), suggested by or founded on M. Ernest Bosc's similar work, supplies a distinct want, and supplies it very well.

A seventh and revised edition has appeared of Mr. Sandars's well-known and highly-valued edition of Justinian's Institutes (10).

Messrs. Suttaby issue, as one of a series of Devotional Manuals, a charming edition of *The Christian Year* (11).

We have received the *Incorporated Law Society Calendar* for 1883 (12).

Part XXII. of *English Etchings* (13) contains three good pieces of work by Mr. Aikman, Mr. Currie, and Mr. W. P. Crooke.

The fifth volume of the attractive work, *Our Own Country* (14), has appeared, and is equal in interest and picturesqueness to those which have preceded it.

A Crown of Flowers (15) is a selection of graceful verses and graceful pictures, chosen from the pages of the *Girl's Own Paper*.

H. C. W.'s catalogue raisonné of Swiss wild flowers (16) makes its appearance as a beautiful volume, beautifully illustrated, and will give pleasure to all lovers of flowers and of Switzerland. The author's intimation that he has succeeded in making *Gnaphalium Leontopodium* grow in pots in England will also, no doubt, please many people, though potted Edelweiss seems something of an anomaly. However, as within our knowledge two strenuous attempts to get it to grow wild on the Dartmoor tors turned out complete failures, perhaps one should be thankful to it for condescending to grow at all in England.

A seventh edition has appeared of Sir Edmund Beckett's Treatise on Clocks, Watches, and Bells (17).

A third edition of Mr. Indermaur's *Principles of the Common Law* (18) is issued by Messrs. Stevens & Haynes.

The Technological Handbook of Glass-making (19) is a singularly interesting little work on which no pains have been spared to ensure completeness.

Messrs. Bentley issue a new edition of some of the most interesting memoirs in existence—those of Mme. Junot (20).

We have from Messrs. Paul & Co. the seventh volume of the Parchment Library Shakspere (21).

(5) *Waugh's Complete Works*. Vol. VII. *Rambles in the Lake Country*. Manchester and London: Heywood, Deansgate, & Ringfield.

(6) *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*. By O. W. Holmes. New and revised edition. Edinburgh: David Douglas.

(7) *The Clergy List* for 1883. London: John Hall.

(8) *The Philosophy of Advertising, and Newspaper Register*. London: Sampson Low & Co.

(9) *An Illustrated Dictionary of Words used in Art and Archaeology*. By J. W. Mollett. London: Sampson Low & Co.

(10) *The Institutes of Justinian*. With English Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Thomas Collett Sandars, M.A. Seventh edition, revised and corrected. London: Longmans & Co.

(11) *The Christian Year*. London: Suttaby & Co.

(12) *The Incorporated Law Society Calendar for the year 1883*. London: published by authority of the Council.

(13) *English Etchings*. Part XXII. London: William Reeves.

(14) *Our Own Country*. Vol. V. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

(15) *A Crown of Flowers*. London: The Religious Tract Society.

(16) *Wild Flowers of Switzerland*. By H. C. W. London: Sampson Low & Co.

(17) *A Rudimentary Treatise on Clocks and Watches and Bells*. By Sir Edmund Beckett, Bart. Seventh edition, revised and enlarged. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co.

(18) *Principles of the Common Law*. By John Indermaur, Solicitor. Third edition. London: Stevens & Haynes.

(19) *Technological Handbooks—The Principles of Glass-making*. By Harry J. Powell, B.A. Together with Treatises on Crown and Sheet Glass, by Henry Chaner, and Plate-Glass, by H. G. Harris. London: Bell & Sons.

(20) *Memoirs of Madame Junot, Duchesse d'Abbrantes*. 3 vols. New edition. London: Bentley & Son.

(21) *Shakspere*. Vol. VII. Parchment Library. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications: and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 4d., or \$7 58 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, Mr. DAVID JONES, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 4 Trafalgar Square, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

FRANCE.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines, Paris, and 59 Rue d'Antibes, Cannes.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.
Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 1,428, MARCH 10, 1883:

Kilmallock. South African Affairs.
Lord Lansdowne's Motion. Egypt. The American Tariff Bill.
The Resurrection of Gambetta. Westminster and Hurlingham.
Indian Criminal Procedure. The Cattle Question.

Bath. The Wady Sadr Mystery.
More Railway Vandalism. A Leading-String for Our Masters.
Elegian's. A Boon to Intending Murderers. Boarding Out.
Utilitarian Theories of Persecution. Marine Insurance.

Stephen's History of the Criminal Law.
Wilfred's Widow. Sunny Lands and Seas. The Life and Times of St. Anselm.
Mystical Verse. It was a Lover and his Lass.
Seebohm's History of British Birds. Buddhist Literature in China.
Minor Notices.

CONTENTS OF NO. 1,427, MARCH 3, 1883:

The Debate on the Ad'res—Mr. Gladstone—The Bankruptcy Bill—The French Chamber and the New Cabinet—Sentimental Legislation for India—County Boards—The Congo—Army Waste—Rotten Foundations.

The Ashburnham Manuscripts and M. Libri—The Right Hon. Captain Bobadil, M.P.—Catalogue of the Buddhist Scriptures—Rhythm—Two Views of Dr. Pusey and the Oxford Movement—A Japanese Novel—Wagner's Music—Diseases at Sea—The American Railway System.

James and Philip van Artevelde—Barbary—Charmes's Five Months at Cairo—James Nasmyth—Mrs. Lorimer—Elwin and Courthope's Pope—Arabian Society in the Middle Ages—The Captains' Room—Life of Lord Hawke—illustrious Shoemakers—French Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORE'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 32 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six, 1s.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.—CORK EXHIBITION, 1883.—

It is intended to hold an EXHIBITION of MANUFACTURES, ARTS, PRODUCTS, and INDUSTRIES in the CITY OF CORK, and to open it in the first week of July. It will remain open for from two to three months. Applications for space should be sent addressed to L. A. BEAMISH, Hon. Secretary, Exhibition Buildings, Cork, before March 17; but Fine Art applications will be received until March 31.

Forms of Application for space may be obtained from the HON. SECRETARY, at the above address; who will also gladly receive and acknowledge Donations to the Exhibition Fund.

THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF MUSICIANS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Instituted in 1798. Incorporated in 1799.
For the Support and Maintenance of Aged and Indigent Musicians, their Widows and Orphans, 12 Little Street, Leicester Square, W.

Patroness.

HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

The 14th ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL will take place on Tuesday, March 13, at St. James's Hall.

President of the day—ARTHUR SULLIVAN, Esq., Mus. Doc. Oxon. et Cantab.
Dinner at half-past Six for Seven precisely. Tickets, 21s. each. A limited number of Ladies' Tickets, admitting to the Balcony, 1s. each. To be had of the Committee; at St. James's Hall; of the Collector, Mr. J. W. Standen, 12 Albert Street, Mornington Crescent; and of the Secretary, Mr. Stanley Lucas, 24 New Bond Street, W.

THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF MUSICIANS of GREAT BRITAIN, by public Donations, Life Subscriptions of Two Guinea Legacies, and Subscriptions received during the year, will be announced at the Anniversary meeting on March 13, and which the Committee will most thankfully acknowledge. Last year the Society expended over £3,000 on the maintenance of aged Musicians, their Widows, and Orphans.

INSTITUTION of NAVAL ARCHITECTS.

SESSION 1883.

The MEETINGS will be held on March 14, 15, and 16, in the Hall of the Society of Arts, John Street, Adelphi (by permission of the Council).

The Right Hon. the Earl of RAVENSWORTH, President of the Institution, will occupy the Chair.

For Cards of Admission apply to the SECRETARY, 5 Adelphi Terrace, Strand, W.C.

OVERSLADE, near RUGBY.—The Rev. G. F. WRIGHT, M.A., of long experience, late Fellow of C.C.C. Cambridge, and formerly Assistant Master at Shrewsbury School and at Wellington College, prepares BOYS for the Public Schools.

